

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, October 1, 1985

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Russell F. Blowers, senior pastor, East 91st Street Christian Church, Indianapolis, IN, offered the following prayer:

"God, You are our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble. Therefore we will not fear, though the Earth give way and the mountains fall into the heart of the sea, though its waters roar and foam and the mountains quake.

"Nations are in uproar, kingdoms fall; You lift Your voice and the Earth melts. The Lord Almighty is with us; the God of Jacob is our fortress.

"He makes wars cease to the ends of the Earth; He breaks the bow and shatters the spear and burns the chariots with fire. Be still and know that I am God; I will be exalted among the nations, I will be exalted in the Earth."

Father God, You are the audience to what is said and done in open and in secret by the Members of this House.

At the beginning of this new day and month we will be still, and know that You are the Sovereign God in whom we live and move and have our being and our hope and our confidence.

We praise You together in the name of Jesus, Christ our Lord. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will announce there will be no 1 minutes at this time today with the exception of the one by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON]. The 1 minutes will take place later in the day.

We will go immediately to consideration of the farm bill after this vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 279, nays 126, answered "present" 2, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 321]

## YEAS—279

Ackerman	Edwards (CA)	Lipinski
Akaka	English	Long
Alexander	Erdreich	Lowery (CA)
Anderson	Evans (IL)	Lowry (WA)
Andrews	Fascell	Lujan
Annuzio	Fawell	Lujan
Anthony	Fazio	Lukens
Applegate	Feighan	Lundine
Archer	Fish	MacKay
Aspin	Flippo	Manton
Atkins	Florio	Markey
AuCoin	Foglietta	Marlenee
Barnard	Foley	Martinez
Barnes	Ford (TN)	Matsui
Bateman	Powder	Mavroules
Bates	Frank	Mazzoli
Bedell	Frenzel	McCloskey
Bellenson	Frost	McCurdy
Bennett	Fuqua	McDade
Berman	Gaydos	McHugh
Bevill	Geldenson	McKinney
Biaggi	Gephardt	Mica
Boggs	Gibbons	Mikulski
Boland	Gilman	Miller (WA)
Boner (TN)	Glickman	Mineta
Bonior (MI)	Gonzalez	Moakley
Bonker	Gordon	Mollinari
Borski	Gradison	Mollohan
Bosco	Gray (IL)	Montgomery
Boucher	Gray (PA)	Moody
Boulter	Green	Moore
Boxer	Guarini	Morrison (CT)
Breaux	Hall (OH)	Mrazek
Broomfield	Hall, Ralph	Murphy
Brown (CA)	Hamilton	Murtha
Broyhill	Hammerschmidt	Myers
Bruce	Hansen	Natcher
Bryant	Hatcher	Neal
Burton (CA)	Hawkins	Nelson
Bustamante	Heftel	Nichols
Byron	Heftel	Nowak
Carper	Hertel	O'Brien
Carr	Hillis	Oakar
Chapman	Hopkins	Oberstar
Chappell	Horton	Obey
Clinger	Howard	Olin
Coats	Hoyer	Ortiz
Coleman (TX)	Hubbard	Owens
Collins	Huckaby	Panetta
Conyers	Hughes	Pashayan
Cooper	Hutto	Pease
Coyne	Hyde	Pepper
Crockett	Jeffords	Perkins
Daniel	Jenkins	Petri
Darden	Johnson	Pickle
Daschle	Jones (OK)	Porter
Davis	Jones (TN)	Price
de la Garza	Kanjorski	Pursell
DeLay	Kaptur	Quillen
Dellums	Kastenmeyer	Rahall
Derrick	Kemp	Rangel
Dicks	Kennelly	Ray
DioGuardi	Kildee	Regula
Dixon	Kliczka	Reid
Donnelly	Kolter	Richardson
Dorgan (ND)	Kostmayer	Rinaldo
Dornan (CA)	LaFalce	Ritter
Downey	Lantos	Robinson
Duncan	Leath (TX)	Rodino
Dwyer	Lehman (CA)	Roe
Dyson	Lehman (FL)	Rose
Eckart (OH)	Levin (MI)	Rostenkowski
Eckert (NY)	Levine (CA)	Rowland (GA)
Edgar		Roybal
		Rudd

Russo  
Sabo  
Savage  
Scheuer  
Schneider  
Schumer  
Sharp  
Shelby  
Sisisky  
Slattery  
Smith (FL)  
Smith (IA)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Snyder  
Solarz  
Spratt  
Staggers  
Stallings

Stark  
Stenholm  
Stokes  
Stratton  
Studds  
Swift  
Synar  
Tausin  
Thomas (GA)  
Torres  
Torricelli  
Traficant  
Traxler  
Udall  
Valentine  
Vander Jagt  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Volkmer

Walgren  
Watkins  
Waxman  
Weaver  
Weiss  
Wheat  
Whitehurst  
Whitley  
Whitten  
Wilson  
Wirth  
Wise  
Wolpe  
Wright  
Wyden  
Wyllie  
Yates  
Yatron  
Young (MO)

## NAYS—126

Armey	Hendon	Roberts
Badham	Hiler	Roemer
Bartlett	Holt	Rogers
Barton	Hunter	Roth
Bentley	Ireland	Roukema
Bereuter	Jacobs	Rowland (CT)
Billrakis	Kasich	Saxton
Bliley	Kindness	Schaefer
Boehlert	Kolbe	Schroeder
Brown (CO)	Kramer	Schuetz
Burton (IN)	Lagomarsino	Sensenbrenner
Callahan	Latta	Shaw
Campbell	Leach (IA)	Shumway
Chandler	Lent	Shuster
Chappie	Lewis (CA)	Sikorski
Cheney	Lewis (FL)	Siljander
Clay	Lightfoot	Skeen
Cobey	Livingston	Slaughter
Coble	Lloyd	Smith, Denny
Coleman (MO)	Lott	(OR)
Combest	Lungren	Smith, Robert
Conte	Mack	(NH)
Coughlin	Madigan	Smith, Robert
Courter	Martin (IL)	(OR)
Craig	McCain	Snowe
Crane	McCollum	Solomon
Dannemeyer	McEwen	Spence
Daub	McGrath	Stangeland
DeWine	McKernan	Strang
Dickinson	McMillan	Stump
Dreier	Meyers	Sundquist
Durbin	Michel	Swindall
Emerson	Miller (OH)	Tauke
Evans (IA)	Mitchell	Taylor
Fiedler	Monson	Thomas (CA)
Fields	Moorhead	Vucanovich
Gallo	Morrison (WA)	Walker
Gekas	Nielson	Weber
Goodling	Oxley	Wolf
Gregg	Packard	Wortley
Grothberg	Parris	Young (AK)
Gunderson	Penny	Young (FL)
Hartnett	Ridge	Zschau

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Dymally McCandless

## NOT VOTING—27

Addabbo	Franklin	Schulze
Brooks	Garcia	Seiberling
Carney	Gingrich	Skelton
Coelho	Hefner	St Germain
Dingell	Jones (NC)	Sweeney
Dowdy	Leland	Tallon
Early	Loeffler	Towns
Edwards (OK)	Martin (NY)	Whittaker
Ford (MI)	Miller (CA)	Williams

□ 1225

So the Journal was approved.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Boldface type indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

# SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Saunders, one of his secretaries.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1210. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Science Foundation for the fiscal year 1986, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2419. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1986 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the U.S. Government, the Intelligence Community staff, and the Central Intelligence Agency retirement and disability system, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3036. An act making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 3036) "An act making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. LAXALT, Mr. MATTINGLY, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. DECONCINI, and Mr. STENNIS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 2419) "An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1986 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the U.S. Government, the Intelligence Community Staff, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. DURENBERGER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. HECHT, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. NUNN, Mr. BOREN, and Mr. BRADLEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1701. An act to authorize a partial transfer of the authority of the Maine-New Hampshire Interstate Bridge Authority to the States of Maine and New Hampshire;

S.J. Res. 189. Joint resolution designating the week beginning January 12, 1986, as "National Fetal Alcohol Syndrome Awareness Week";

S.J. Res. 201. Joint resolution to designate the week beginning September 22, 1985, as "National Needlework Week"; and

S.J. Res. 206. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate the month of December 1985, as "Made in America Month."

## REV. RUSSELL BLOWERS

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, soon after I entered politics I met Dr. Russ Blowers—pastor of the East 91st Street Christian Church in Indianapolis. Russ is one of the outstanding men in Indiana, and in my view America as well.

He received his education at Ohio University and Christian Theological Seminary. Milligan College subsequently awarded him an honorary doctor of divinity degree in 1974.

He's been president of the 1975 North American Christian Convention, and serves on the board of directors of the British American Fellowship Committee. In 1980 he was chairman of the Central Indiana Billy Graham Crusade. He's also authored two fine books.

He's married to a wonderful lady, Marian, and they have two fine sons, Philip and Paul.

His accomplishments and contributions are to numerous to mention—so I'll end by simply saying he's a true man of God, and I consider it an honor to call him my friend.

## PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

## O. EDMUND CLUBB

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1863) for the relief of O. Edmund Clubb.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1863

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress finds that—*

(1) O. Edmund Clubb served from 1928 until his retirement in 1952 as a United States Foreign Service Officer, with eighteen years of service in China, including assignment from 1947 to 1950 as United States Counsel General in Peiping (Peking), China;

(2) certain personal possessions belonging to Mr. Clubb, consisting generally of his personal collection of valuable objects of d'art and rare manuscripts, were removed and detained by local Chinese authorities from a shipment of his personal effects following his departure from China in 1950, or

otherwise became unaccounted for in the course of such departure;

(3) in the expectation that these possessions could be regained through diplomatic representations by the British and United States Governments to the Government of the People's Republic of China, Mr. Clubb refrained from pursuing claims for compensation against the Chinese or United States Government;

(4) all diplomatic efforts to locate and regain these possessions have been exhausted without result, leaving no recourse but to consider them as an uncompensated loss, having occurred during the service of Mr. Clubb as a civilian employee of the United States Government; and

(5) there remains no other remedy for this loss than to obtain compensatory payment from the United States Government, of which Mr. Clubb was an employee at the time of the loss, and in the service of which the loss occurred.

SEC. 2(a) The Secretary of State shall settle and pay, in accordance with section 3 of the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees Claims Act of 1964 (31 U.S.C. 241), the amount of claims by O. Edmund Clubb, of Palenville, New York, against the United States—

(1) For the loss of his personal property which occurred as a result of or incident of his service in the Foreign Service of the United States in Peiping (Peking), China from 1947 to 1950, plus interest at a rate of 6 per centum from the date of the loss, and

(2) for those costs of shipping his personal effects from China, following that period of service, which were authorized by the Federal Government but for which Mr. Clubb was not reimbursed, plus interest at a rate of 6 per centum per annum from the date of the shipment or shipments involved.

Such claims shall be determined notwithstanding those provisions of subsection (b)(1) of section 3 of the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees Claims Act of 1964, relating to the time at which claims arose and limiting the amount of a claim, and notwithstanding subsection (c)(1) of that section.

(b) In determining the amount of claims described in subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary of State shall deduct any amounts which O. Edmund Clubb has received from any source on account of the same claims.

(c) The payment of any claims described in subsection (a) of this section shall be made from funds made available to carry out section 3 or section 9 of the Military Personnel and Civilian Employee Claims Act of 1964 (31 U.S.C. 241 or 243a).

(d) The account in the Treasury from which payments are made pursuant to subsection (c) of this section shall be reimbursed, to the extent of those payments, from any sums described in subsection (f)(1) of section 8 of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 (22 U.S.C. 1627(f)(1)) that remain after all payments are made pursuant to subsection (f) of such section 8.

SEC. 3. Any amounts paid to O. Edmund Clubb under this Act shall be in full settlement of any claim he has against the United States or the Government of the People's Republic of China arising from the loss of property or the shipping costs described in section 2(a) of this Act.

SEC. 4. No amount in excess of 10 per centum of the amount paid pursuant to section 2 of this Act shall be paid to or received by any agent or attorney in connection with



the claims described in section 2(a) of this Act. Any person violating this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be fined not more than \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$15,086.70, plus interest in the amount of 6 per centum from July 31, 1970, to Mr. O. Edmund Clubb of Palenville, New York, in full settlement of all his claims against the United States for the loss of personal property incident to his service as Counsel General in Peking, China, in 1950.

Sec. 2. It shall be unlawful for any amount in excess of 10 per centum of the payment referred to in the first section of this Act to be paid to, delivered to, or received by any agency or attorney in consideration for services rendered in connection with such payment. Any person who violates this section shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than \$1,000.

Mr. BOUCHER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill and the committee amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### RICHARD W. IRELAND

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1261) for the relief of Richard W. Ireland.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1261

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of Agriculture shall pay, out of any appropriations or other funds available to the Secretary for the reimbursement of relocation expenses under section 5724a of title 5, United States Code, to Richard W. Ireland, \$5,102.08. Such sum shall be in full satisfaction of any claim by Richard W. Ireland, and employee of the Farmers Home Administration, for expenses—

(1) which were incurred in connection with the sale of his residence and transportation of his household goods when he was transferred from Auburn, Maine, to Presque Isle, Maine; and

(2) for which he could have been reimbursed under section 5724a had he been able to complete the sale within the two year time limit prescribed in paragraph 2-6.1e of the Federal Travel Regulations (FPMR 101-7, May 1973) instead of the three year time period erroneously approved by the State Director of the Farmers Home Administration.

Sec. 2. No part of the amount provided for in the first section of this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid to or received by an agent or attorney on account of

services rendered in connection with the claim described in the first section, and the payment or receipt in excess of 10 per centum of the amount provided for in the first section shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Violation of the provisions of this section is a misdemeanor punishable by a fine not to exceed \$1,000.

Mr. BOUCHER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### STEVEN McKENNA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1598) for the relief of Steven McKenna.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

#### BETSY L. RANDALL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2991) for the relief of Betsy L. Randall.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2991

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That Betsy L. Randall is relieved of all liability to repay the United States \$523.82. Such amount represents money advanced for relocation travel in anticipation of employment with the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture in 1982, and was advanced pursuant to a properly executed Travel Authorization. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this Act.

Mr. BOUCHER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PAULETTE MENDES-SILVA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2316) for the relief of Paulette Mendes-Silva.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

#### ELECTION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican conference, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 280) electing Representative COMBEST of Texas to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 280

*Resolved,* That Representative Larry Combest of Texas be and is hereby elected to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, DC, September 30, 1985.  
Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,  
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5, Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received at 4:10 p.m. on Monday, September 30, 1985, the following messages from the Secretary of the Senate:

(1) That the Senate passed H.R. 3452; and  
(2) That the Senate passed H.R. 3454.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely,

BENJAMIN J. GUTHRIE,  
Clerk, House of Representatives.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, The Speaker pro tempore signed the following enrolled bill on Monday, September 30, 1985:

H.R. 3452. An act to extend for 45 days the application of tobacco excise taxes, trade adjustment assistance, certain Medicare reimbursement provisions, and borrowing authority under the Rail-Road Unemployment Insurance Program.

And the following enrolled bill earlier today:

H.R. 3454. An act to extend temporarily certain provisions of law.

# REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOURNAL RESOLUTION 3, TO PREVENT NUCLEAR EXPLOSIVE TESTING

Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. 99-294) on the resolution (H. Res. 281) providing for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 3) to prevent nuclear explosive testing, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

# REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3327, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1986

Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 99-295) on the resolution (H. Res. 282) waiving certain points of order against consideration of the bill (H.R. 3327) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

# APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2959, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1986

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2959) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. BEVILL, Mrs. BOGGS, Messrs. CHAPPELL, FAZIO, WATKINS, BONER of Tennessee, WHITTEN, and MYERS of Indiana, Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. RUDD, and Mr. CONTE.

# PERMISSION TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, OCTOBER 9, 1985, TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2959, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1986

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight, Wednesday, October 9, 1985, to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 2959) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending

September 30, 1986, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

# PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE—RETURNING TO SENATE S. 1712, EXTENDING CERTAIN EXCISE TAX RATES

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House. I send to the desk a privileged resolution (H. Res. 283) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 283

*Resolved*, That the bill of the Senate (S. 1712) to provide an extension of certain excise tax rates, in the opinion of this House, contravenes the first clause of the seventh section of the first article of the Constitution of the United States and is an infringement of the privileges of this House and that such bill be respectfully returned to the Senate with a message communicating this resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is simple and straightforward. On September 26, 1985, the Senate passed S. 1712, legislation which would extend the 16-cents-per-pack cigarette excise tax rate for 45 days, through November 14, 1985. As passed by the Senate, the bill clearly is a revenue measure. As such, the bill on its face violates the prerogatives of the House of Representatives under the Constitution to originate revenue bills.

Mr. Speaker, in this instance, the Senate has taken it upon itself to directly originate an entire revenue bill. There can be no clearer case where the prerogatives of the House of Representatives have been disregarded by the other body.

Yesterday, the House passed H.R. 3452, the Emergency Extension Act of 1985. That legislation, which included a 45-day extension of the existing cigarette excise tax rates, also passed the Senate and was signed into law by the President.

Mr. Speaker, S. 1712 should be returned to the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# DEFERRALS OF BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 1986—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 99-111)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Tuesday, October 1, 1985.)

# DEFERRALS OF BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 1985—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 99-112)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Tuesday, October 1, 1985.)

□ 1235

# FOOD SECURITY ACT OF 1985

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 267 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 2100.

□ 1236

# IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2100) to extend and revise agricultural price support and related programs, to provide for agricultural export, resource conservation, farm credit, and agricultural research and related programs, to continue food assistance to low-income persons, to ensure consumers an abundance of food and fiber at reasonable prices, and for other purposes, with Mr. BONIOR of Michigan in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, September 26, title IV was open to amendment at any point to amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD before September 24, 1985.

Are there amendments to title IV?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GLICKMAN

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.



Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GLICKMAN: Title IV of H.R. 2100 is amended by—

On page 65, after line 8, striking all through "shall" on line 11 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) If the Secretary determines that the availability of nonrecourse loans and purchases will not have an adverse effect on the program provided for in paragraph (3), the Secretary may";

On page 67, after line 5, striking "The Secretary may" and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(3)(A) Unless the Secretary, at the Secretary's discretion, makes available nonrecourse loans and purchases to producers under paragraph (2) for a crop of wheat, the Secretary shall";

On page 68, line 23 before the "." insert the following: ", except that the Secretary shall not make available payments under this paragraph to any producer with a wheat acreage base of less than 15 acres for the crop.";

On page 70, after line 11, striking all through line 12, page 71 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(C) For each crop of wheat, the established price shall not be less than the following levels for each farm:

"(i) \$4.50 per bushel for any portion of the crop produced on each farm that does not exceed fifteen thousand bushels and

"(ii) \$4.00 per bushel for any portion of the crop produced on each farm that exceeds fifteen thousand bushels.";

On page 86, line 15 striking "may not" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "shall";

On page 86, line 18 striking "may" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "shall"; and

Title V of H.R. 2100 is amended by—

On page 87, after line 15, striking all through "shall" on line 18 and inserting in lieu thereof the following—

"(2)(A) If the Secretary determines that the availability of nonrecourse loans and purchases will not have an adverse effect on the program provided for in paragraph (3), the Secretary may";

On page 89, after line 11, striking all through "shall" on line 15 and inserting in lieu thereof the following—

"(B) If the Secretary determines that the availability of nonrecourse loans and purchases will not have an adverse effect on the program provided for in paragraph (3), the Secretary may";

On page 89, line 5, striking "The Secretary may" and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(3)(A) Unless the Secretary, at the Secretary's discretion, makes available nonrecourse loans and purchases to producers under paragraph (2) for a crop of corn the Secretary shall";

On page 90, line 21, striking "The Secretary may" and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(B) Unless the Secretary, at the Secretary's discretion, makes available nonrecourse loans and purchases to producers under paragraph (2) for a crop of feed grains the Secretary shall";

On page 92, line 4, before the "." insert the following: ", except that the Secretary shall not make available payments under this paragraph to any producer with a feed

grains acreage base of less than 15 acres for the crop.";

On page 93, after line 19 striking all through line 20, page 94 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(C) For each crop of corn, the established price shall not be less than the following levels for each farm:

"(i) \$3.10 per bushel for any portion of the crop produced on each farm that does not exceed thirty thousand bushels and

"(ii) \$2.75 per bushel for any portion of the crop produced on each farm that exceeds thirty thousand bushels.";

On page 109, line 12 striking "may not" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "shall"; and

On page 109, line 15 striking "may" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "shall";

Mr. GLICKMAN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, rather than taking the time of the full House, rather than talking about the substance of the amendment, in order to expedite the process, I wonder if we might deal with the point of order right now, and if the Chair rules that it is out of order, there is no reason why I have to spend 5 or 10 minutes explaining the amendment.

#### POINTS OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois insist on his point of order?

Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Chairman, under my reservation, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend. Under a reservation of a point of order, the gentleman cannot yield time. If other Members have points of order, they can make them and they will be so recognized.

Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Chairman, I believe a point of order would lie against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN] because the amendment, if I understand the amendment that is being offered, goes to more than one title of the bill, and I think that because it goes to more than one title of the bill, it would not be in order at this point.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I speak to the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN] is recognized.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment amends two titles of the bill. To be frank with the Chair, it was submitted as one amendment, but the intention of the author of this amendment as well as the other authors was to deal with the issues as they affected title IV and then title V. I put it in one title of the bill, but, to be honest with

the Chair, the issues are divisible, they are separate. I could have amended it and put it in two separate amendments. I did not because that is not the way the issue came up in the Committee on Agriculture.

The issues relating to the issue of targeting deficiency payments to small- and medium-sized farmers and utilizing a device called the marketing loan as a way to deal with our exports; they are in the wheat section, title IV, and there is a separate matter, deals with it separately in the feed grains section, title V.

The amendments are divisible. The language is divisible, and I would hope that the Chair would understand that it was the intent of the author of the amendment to really consider these two as two separate concepts, but I put them together for the ease of putting them in one amendment, since feed grains in the committee were dealt with as one basic issue.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. I thank the Chair.

Mr. Chairman, rule III of the rules provides that considerations can only be by title, not by section. I think the point remains that there is no question that this amendment does affect two titles. There are several other amendments, Mr. Chairman, that I will rise on this same issue affecting both sides of the aisle. I think to keep this whole discussion clean, we should follow the rule. The rule clearly states that you cannot amend two titles in one amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there others who wish to be heard?

Does the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STANGELAND] make a point of order on this?

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to make a point of order. I reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman making a point of order on this amendment?

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Chairman, I am arguing against the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. STANGELAND. I thank the Chair. I just want to make the point that the amendment was printed in two distinctly separate sections. One portion of the amendment dealt with wheat and target prices and marketing loans. The second section of the amendment deals with title V, the feed grain section. Two distinctly different amendments but introduced in the RECORD as, unfortunately, one amendment. But they deal with the two sec-

tions separately. I would just appeal to the Chair that the intent of the authors was that because they were handled en bloc in committee, we would run that way, but they are divisible, they can be addressed to title IV and title V very distinctly in the amendment.

I thank the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BONIOR of Michigan). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair would state that the Chair can only look at the form in which the amendment has been submitted for printing in the RECORD. According to the rule, the substitute shall be considered for amendment by title instead of by sections, and only amendments to the bill which have been printed in the RECORD by September 24 may be offered.

Therefore, the only way in which the amendment that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN] wishes to offer could be considered is by unanimous consent.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized.

There was no objection.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon—

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

Mr. GLICKMAN. I have the time, 5 minutes. The Chairman has given me 5 minutes.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, may I ask under what order the gentleman is speaking?

Mr. GLICKMAN. I moved to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas moved to strike the last word. The Chair asked if there was objection. Hearing none, the gentleman was recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GLICKMAN. I would just say to my colleague from Oregon that I am going to get these amendments offered in one way or the other. If they are not offered in this way, it is my understanding the gentleman from North Dakota is going to offer amendments on the wheat section and on the feed grains section separately, and I am going to move to amend those sections of the bill to include this language.

Now, given that that is the case, I wonder if the gentleman would object if I would divide the amendment I just offered and agree if I offer the wheat section only, because if the gentleman does not, I am going to come right back and amend his section. Why waste the committee's time?

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLICKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I can only suggest that the gentleman should do what he can do within the rules. I am merely pointing out that technically it has been sustained by the Chair that the amendment in its form is not properly before the House.

Now, whatever avenues the gentleman might like to pursue he must take. I am going to continue to object to the kind of amendment that is here and will object to the division because the gentleman has another alternative.

Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLICKMAN. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADIGAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman there probably might be more willingness to ignore the rules if we were not mixing various elements of various proposals here. Targeting is one thing; market loan is something else. To try to consider those jointly is perhaps objectionable to some people who might not consider one or the other objectionable, and that might be something the gentleman would want to think about.

I certainly do not want to frustrate the will of the House or the opportunity of any Member to present things to the House for them to work their will. But to tie on the targeting to the marketing loan concept is sort of to blackmail certain people who might be for the marketing loan and would have to accept the targeting because they wanted to vote for the marketing loan. I think the gentleman understands that.

Mr. GLICKMAN. I do understand it. I would object to the characterization of "blackmail." This is the way it was offered in the full Committee on Agriculture and almost prevailed by a margin of 22 to 20. But I am not going to take the time of the House. I am going to try to work the legislative will of this body as the amending process continues.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DORGAN OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota: Page 70, strike out line 19 and all that follows thereafter through page 71, line 19, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(C) The established price for the 1986 through 1990 crops of wheat shall be \$5.25 per bushel for any portion of the crop produced on each farm that does not exceed twelve thousand bushels.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Kansas indicated, a number of us have been working in different ways to try and provide some targeting to price supports in the bill reported out by the Committee on Agriculture.

Let me explain briefly what my amendment does and then indicate that I expect my amendment will be either amended or substituted for by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN].

My intent has been to see if we can turn the corner here on farm policy and use our money as effectively as we can to provide the strongest support price possible for the family farm. We have limited resources in this country to devote to agriculture. Yet, with limited resources we tend to use those resources in a manner that, in my judgement, is not in the best interests of agriculture.

Our dollars tend to follow production, those who produce the most get the most; those who produce the most and get the most need it the least. Therefore, using the same amount of money or less, why do we not consider providing a stronger target price for the first increment of production?

In the amendment that I have introduced, it would provide for a \$5.25 target price for the first 12,000 bushels of wheat production.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN], when he offers his amendment, will provide for a \$4.50 target price for wheat for the first 15,000 bushels and \$4 target price over that.

Now the approach here is to simply say this: We have to decide in this country whether our public policy is designed to promote a network of family farms. If it is not, then let us continue doing what we have been doing and we will see record farm failures, we will use a lot of money, and it will all follow production. Those who produce the most will get the most, and they need it the least.

But if we want to change all that, let us use our resources in a way that provides a much stronger support price for the first increment of production.

It is not an approach that says, "Big is bad," or, "Small is beautiful;" it simply says as a matter of public policy we think it is in this country's interests we think it is in this country's security interest to maintain a network of family farms.

How best do you do that? You use whatever resources you have available to you to layer in with the best support price possible for that increment of production that you can cover with your resources, believing then that you have told family farmers that if they work hard and if they pay atten-



tion to management, they can make a living out there on the farm.

□ 1250

They have done this in Japan; they have done it in Western Europe. A number of countries have made that policy decision that, yes, we want, as a matter of public policy, to do what is necessary to maintain a network of family farms. We have not done that in this country. The manner in which we spend our money for support prices for agriculture determines whether we have a public policy that says we want a network of family farms in America's future. That is the reason I have introduced this amendment. Since I drafted this amendment earlier this year in a bill and then noticed it to the House as an amendment, I worked with the gentleman from Kansas, the gentleman from Minnesota, the gentleman from South Dakota and others, to see if we could not agree to an approach that targets farm price supports in a responsible way.

I intend to support the gentleman from Kansas in his effort as a substitute to this to try to provide some targeting because that will be the first step in turning the corner to use our public dollars to promote the existence in the long term in America of a network of family farms.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to thank the gentleman from North Dakota for presenting this issue to the floor.

The gentleman from Minnesota will be offering a substitute to the gentleman's amendment. That substitute will modify the numbers on the targeting and add the marketing loan language. But I want to say to my colleagues that the issue here is a very important issue. The issue is: Do we think that the farm program benefits are to be targeted to small- and medium-size farmers who, for the most part, need that help more than do farmers in the largest 5 percent? And the second part of the substitute will be based on the marketing loan concept. But the Members should understand that this is an important issue in this bill. It has not gotten quite the play that the referendum language has. But the issue is: Should we target farm programs?

And I might say to my colleagues that the other body in their bill so far have in fact done this. They have targeted farm programs, essentially based on size, and I think as a matter of policy we ought to be doing that.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Reclaiming my time, let me say in conclusion that if you are a farmer in Western Europe, in France, in Germany, in Italy, and you raise wheat, you are provided a much higher support price than you are provided for raising

wheat here in America. If you are a farmer in Japan, it is even higher than the support price you get in Western Europe.

Now, it is not because we are not spending the money. Lord knows, we spend lots of money on agriculture. It is because the money is moving in the wrong direction. We are, with a loan rate, undergirding every single bushel produced by those who produce the largest crops in America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, we are spending plenty of money. Let us spend it the right way.

I neglected, when I began, to say that I have worked with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STANGELAND]. Part of this is also the marketing loan, which I think is a good idea, that Congressman STANGELAND has worked on, but, to me, targeting is what is essential in this amendment, and I hope the Members of the House of Representatives will see this as a new approach, a new way to use public dollars more effectively to save the family farm in America.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order was reserved by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH]. Does the gentleman wish to pursue his point of order?

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STANGELAND AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DORGAN OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STANGELAND as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota:

Strike the amendment to page 70 in the Glickman (Dorgan as printed in the Record) amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) on page 68, line 23 before the "." inserting the following: ", except that the Secretary shall not make available payments under this paragraph to any producer with a wheat acreage base of less than 15 acres for the crop.";

"(b) on page 70, after line 11 striking all through page 71, line 12 and inserting in lieu thereof the following—

"(C) For each crop of wheat, the established price shall not be less than the following levels for each farm:

"(i) \$4.50 per bushel for any portion of the crop produced on each farm that does not exceed fifteen thousand bushels and

"(ii) \$4.00 per bushel for any portion of the crop produced on each farm that exceeds fifteen thousand bushels.";

(1) Title IV of H.R. 2100 is amended by—

"(a) on page 65, after line 8, striking all through "shall" on line 11 and inserting in lieu thereof the following—

"(2) If the Secretary determines that the availability of nonrecourse loans and purchases will not have an adverse effect on the program provided for in paragraph (3), the Secretary may";

(b) on page 67, line 5 striking "The Secretary may" and inserting in lieu thereof the following—

"(3)(A) Unless the Secretary, at the Secretary's discretion, makes available nonrecourse loans and purchases to producers under paragraph (2) for a crop of wheat, the Secretary shall";

(c) on page 68, after line 25, inserting the following new paragraph—

"(4)(A) The Secretary may, for each of the 1986 through 1989 crops of wheat, make payments available to producers who, although eligible to obtain a loan or purchase agreement under paragraph (3), agree to forgo obtaining such loan or agreement in return for such payments.

"(B)(i) A payment under this paragraph shall be computed by multiplying—

"(I) the loan payment rate; by

"(II) the quantity of wheat the producer is eligible to place under loan.

"(ii) For purposes of the paragraph, the quantity of wheat eligible to be placed under loan may not exceed the produce obtained by multiplying—

"(I) the individual farm program acreage for the crop; by

"(II) the farm program payment yield established for the farm.

"(C) For purposes of this paragraph, the loan payment rate shall be the amount by which—

"(i) the loan level determined for such crop under paragraph (3); exceeds

"(ii) the level at which a loan may be repaid under paragraph (3)(B).

"(D) Any payments under this paragraph shall not be included in the payments subject to limitations under the provisions of section 1011 of the Food Security Act of 1985."

"(d) on page 68, line 23 before the "." inserting the following: ", except that the Secretary shall not make available payments under this paragraph to any producer with a wheat acreage base of less than 15 acres for the crop.";

"(e) on page 70, after line 11 striking all through line 12, page 71 and inserting in lieu thereof the following—

"(C) For each crop of wheat, the established price shall not be less than the following levels for each farm:

"(i) \$4.50 per bushel for any portion of the crop produced on each farm that does not exceed fifteen thousand bushels and

"(ii) \$4.00 per bushel for any portion of the crop produced on each farm that does not exceed fifteen thousand bushels.";

"(f) on page 86, line 15 striking "may not" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "shall";

"(g) on page 86, line 18 striking "may" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "shall"; and

Mr. STANGELAND (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me say that the substitute amendment now before us is the original Glickman-Stangeland-Roberts-Daschle amendment with a minor technical change to assure that it costs no more than the present committee bill.

I think that's an important point to make. Our amendment does not spend more money than the committee bill, it merely allocates the limited Federal dollars available in a more efficient and cost-effective manner to assist family-sized farmers.

In a nutshell, our amendment directs maximum farm program benefits to the middle 85-90 percent of all U.S. grain farmers having wheat bases from 15-535 acres and corn bases from 15-340 acres. It accomplishes this goal in two ways: First, by implementing a two-tiered target price which permits a higher level of support than the committee bill, but only up to a certain volume of production; and secondly, through the implementation of a recourse marketing loan.

I personally believe that the targeting of direct farm program payments—which we are doing through our two-tiered target price proposal—is a concept whose time has come. Ever since the enactment of the 1981 farm bill, numerous studies have shown that it is not the extremely small hobby farmers primarily dependent upon income earned off the farm, nor is it the large-scale superfarms, which are most in need of farm program benefits.

But the problem with current farm programs is that no such distinction is made. That is a major reason why farm program costs have exploded in recent years, while an ever-growing number of medium-sized family farmers continue to be driven from their land.

For example, in 1984, just 1 percent of the largest wheat farms in the United States received 14 percent of the total direct Government payments. Likewise, 2 percent of the corn producers received 16 percent of the payments.

The committee bill would merely extend this disparity for another 5 years. This amendment offers us the chance, during a time of limited budgetary resources, to direct scarce Federal dollars to commercial-sized family farmers who are most dependent upon income supports.

In addition, the recourse marketing loan feature in this amendment is a way to further insure that our farm programs benefit family-sized farmers.

I'm going to let the members of the House in on a dirty little secret. Our present farm programs indirectly subsidize those producers who are the very cause of our present surplus prob-

lems—that is, the nonparticipants who plant fencerow-to-fencerow.

Any farmer will tell you that, historically, it is those farmers who have not participated in farm programs that have benefited the most. By planting every acre and indirectly benefiting from the market price floor—in effect, an artificial subsidy—that is created under the present nonrecourse farm law, there actually exists a perverse incentive for farmers to avoid supply management efforts.

Under the recourse marketing loan in this amendment, farmers who participate in the farm program will receive the same income protection as they receive under the present nonrecourse farm law. However, farmers who choose not to reduce their production and instead further exacerbate our severe oversupply situation will no longer be protected as they are under current law and the committee bill.

No longer can we afford to artificially prop up the returns received by farmers unwilling to contribute their fair share to resolving today's enormous supply and demand imbalance.

In addition, by permitting producers to repay their loans at the State average price when they redeem, the Government avoids the accumulation of costly and price-depressing surplus stocks while immediately improving farmers' export opportunities.

The essence of this amendment is that, by targeting deficiency payments and implementing a recourse marketing loan, we believe it is possible to more efficiently direct farm program benefits to the commercial-sized family farmer. The overriding question now before this body is: Will we in the Congress show the political will to reform Depression-era farm programs so that they might better meet the needs of American agriculture in the 1980's?

If we choose to continue with the same failed programs that have exacerbated the present crisis in agriculture, it will prove that we are so wedded to the familiarity of the past, that we are unwilling to risk any chances of success in the future.

In conclusion, this amendment is supported by the National Corn Growers Association, the National Grange, Interfaith Action for Economic Justice, and others.

Let's offer farmers a program that can work and offer hope. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure as the debate continues on, on this concept, that we are going to hear in this House that the marketing loan will so reduce prices in the world market that we are going to cause severe impact and pain on Brazil, Argentina, on Mexico, on other countries, much as we heard arguments during the sugar program as to what that program

would do to Central American economies.

Let me say that every farmer and every person in this country wants our friends from Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, and from the lesser developed countries to prosper and grow. But I do not think it that the farmers of this country have the responsibility to bear the burden of those economies on their backs as well as the burdens of our economy. Our farmers' backs are bent under the burdens they are carrying in this economy today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STANGELAND] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. STANGELAND was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. STANGELAND. To add to the burden they are carrying on this economy in this country the economies of those other countries who are having to earn money and earn cash to pay back to international bankers would be to break their backs, and I think we can ill afford that. I think it is time we stood up for American agriculture, that we pass a bill that not only preserves agriculture for today but gives opportunity for tomorrow.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a complicated issue; and, to our colleagues who have not followed the intricacies of the commodity programs, I am going to try to, basically, tell you what the difference is between this bill and the base bill that we have got and these amendments, and I think these are important amendments. I want to compliment my colleague from Minnesota, my colleague from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY], and a whole assortment of other people have indicated their interest in this concept.

Right now in the bill you get the same target price, or deficiency payment or subsidy payment, whatever you want to call it, up to \$50,000, no matter how many bushels you produce. So if you produce 100,000 bushels of wheat, you will get the target price payment per bushel up to the \$50,000 payment limitation and, as you go down from there, you will get the maximum allowable up to the \$50,000 payment limitation. That is all you can get under the target price program. And then if you are a smaller farmer, of course, you get the same dollar, or so, per bushel, and so you will be under that payment limitation. That is, current law does not differentiate between big and small farmers at all. The only thing that keeps this a so-to-speak means-tested program is that there is a \$50,000 cap that nobody



can get any more in target price payments for. We support that. I think that cap is fair and reasonable, and I think it ought to be left at those levels.

Now, what we are trying to do here is to say that we think that since this is basically a deficiency payment, a subsidy payment, that more of it ought to be more targeted to those farmers who are in trouble, small- and medium-size farmers, based upon this particular proposal, that is, targeting at a higher level for the first 15,000 bushels of wheat \$4.50 a bushel and a lower level, anything afterward, \$4 a bushel, we are able to get more target price money to smaller and medium size farmers. And, actually, 97.5 percent of the farms in this country do better or as good or better under this proposal than they do under the committee bill because most farmers would still be eligible for up to the maximum, \$50,000. It is only the very large farms that will not get as much money under this proposal as they would under the committee bill.

So if you are interested in trying to target the effort to those farmers who really need help in this period of farm crisis, this amendment is more suited to that. It is not a radical effort. What we do in this bill is we pay \$4.50 on the first 15,000 bushels, \$4 on the next 15,000 bushels. That is not a lot different than the current bill of \$4.38 on everything, but what it does is, it gets a higher target price to those smaller and medium-size farmers who are probably among the ones who are hurting more than it does the larger farmers.

Now, the next thing it does is, it creates a marketing loan, a recourse marketing loan. And, basically, what we are saying there, it is not too different from what the committee bill is, but only in this sense: The committee bill provides two options to get grain competitively priced. The one option, which is the Findley or Foley option is one that gives the Secretary the authority to lower the loan rate up to 20 percent if he wants to do that. The other option is a marketing loan. The marketing loan, basically, says that the farmer must repay that loan but he will repay it at the world price, which means, honestly, that the price will probably go to world levels immediately. But the farmer is protected in the interim, because the farmer gets his loan at whatever the level is, \$3.14, and he repays it the world price, which might be \$2.50. So the farmer does not lose any money in the process.

Now, some people will argue: Is this not a boon to large farmers? Some people will argue that this is going to get the price down too fast. The fact of the matter is, this is probably the only way we are going to get competitive in the world markets immediately.

The committee bill will not do this. The committee bill will continue keeping our loan levels to the point where the Government will end up owning lots of grain. This amendment provides that the Government will not end up owning lots of grain.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GLICKMAN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. GLICKMAN. Nothing we do here on the floor is going to produce miracles for our farmers. Nothing we do is going to save some folks who are in such bad trouble they cannot be salvaged. But this amendment does do a couple of things as a matter of policy. It targets aid to those who really need it, it targets it to small and midsized producers. That not only is popular, particularly in urban constituencies in this country, but it is right.

It also ensures that most farmers, well over 95 percent, are not prejudiced by this targeting. Only the very largest farmers may get a little bit less than they do right now, and not that much less.

□ 1305

Finally, what it would do is to provide a situation where we can get the farmer competitive in the world markets and doing so in a way that shields him, that shields him for a lower market price.

So I would urge the Members to support this amendment knowing that it does represent a deviation from current farm policy. I am going to support this farm bill even if this amendment does not pass, but I want to tell the Members something: The current farm bill is really nothing more than an extension of current programs. This is the way it is written now with the exception of the Bedell amendment. This amendment makes some changes in the way we have done business, and a lot of people are scared of that because it reflects a difference in the way we provide for farm programs. I still happen to believe that it reflects a creative attempt to get dollars to those farmers who need it and to get us competitive in the world markets.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLICKMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think one of the important points that needs to be made is that in most areas of the country, most of the farmers' production will be covered under this kind of a support price. Now, some people say well, is this not discriminating against the big versus the small and so on. The answer to that is "No." What we are saying is that there is only a certain

amount of money. We are going to use it for a stronger support price, and when we run out of money, we have run out of money. That is kind of the approach we are trying to take initially with the targeting amendment.

I think the gentleman's amendment, although it does not go as far as the amendment I had, is a good start in targeting farm program benefits. I would certainly commend the gentleman for his amendment.

Mr. GLICKMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let us look at the bottom line of these targeting amendments that are being offered. I rise in opposition to this concept as being alien to our concept of supporting the hands-on family farmer.

Rather than promoting the family farmer, it seems to me that by this kind of legislation we are promoting the absentee landlords around this country. We are promoting the doctor, who owns 100 acres of land or a half-section of land. We are promoting the attorney who owns a half-section or a section of land. This is the most prevalent group that received less than 15,000 bushels as a crop share. We are saying, "Let us use our resources and give them more money than we are giving to the hands-on producers of this country, the people that need the help."

Of the 2.2 million farmers surveyed in the 1982 Census, 1 million of these people did not even consider themselves producers. When asked flat out: "Are you an agricultural producer?" They were carried on the Census forms as producers, but they said, "Hey, we are not farmers" when they were asked flat out. Now through this amendment we are targeting our precious resources, that should be going to the family farmer, that should be going to the hands-on producers, we are instead targeting it to some of these 1 million producers who said "Hey we are not farmers."

Also in that 1982 Census survey, farmers who had 100 acres or less were categorized 65 percent absentee landlords, and you want to target our resources to those people? To the doctors, the lawyers, the retired farmers who do not need the assistance? I think we are going about this all in the wrong way.

You know, the national wheat growers, the Montana wheat growers, any wheat-growing organization does not support this concept. They support the kind of commonsense legislation that was put together by TOM FOLEY and myself which attempts to help the hands-on producers. But instead, we have those here who are interested, interested once again, in seeing that we take it from those who have and give

it to those who have not. They are trying to set up class differentials in all segments, not only in social programs that we have, but let us set up differentials in agriculture so that the bigger farmers and the commercial farmers are discriminated against. I say that we have got to reject this targeting concept; that we have got to get back to farm programs that help the hands-on producers and help establish a price for those people so they can stay in business.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARLENEE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman all I wanted to say is that all of us are concerned about a doctor or a lawyer that owns farm land and would collect price supports, but I think the gentleman uses an exception to try and demonstrate a rule.

The rule is out there that if you are in the Farm Program under these provisions you would, A, have to set aside 30 percent, you would have to idle 30 percent. Then you would, under these provisions, have a \$4.50 target price for certain income or production. The rule is that would apply to most of the working farmers in my district, in yours, and in other districts around the country. The question is simply how do we want to spend our money? Do you want to spread it around so that everybody gets an inadequate price support or do you want to target it so that we provide a stronger price support and when we run out of money we say, sorry, but we are out of money, we want to spend it the best way we can to help the most family farmers in America.

Mr. MARLENEE. The given fact is that most producers, most hands-on producers rent agricultural land. They usually rent not one, but two, and three, and four. Four different parcels of land. They do it on a crop share. Most of those people, those four or five landlords get a crop share and they are the ones that get these targeted dollars. If you give these landlords a higher target price than you give the actual producer, it is terrible discrimination. The four or five landlords each get a higher target price yet the poor hands-on producer that farms the five tracts does not get a higher target on each of the five tracts but on only one 15,000-bushel increment. Looks like to me landlords could get a higher target on up to 75,000 bushels and never even visit the farm. The action in adopting this concept shows it 75,000 to 15,000 against the farmer.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VOLKMER TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STANGELAND AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DORGAN OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOLKMER to the amendment offered by Mr. STANGELAND as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota: Wherever it appears in the amendment, strike "15 acres" and insert in lieu thereof "10 acres".

Mr. Chairman, I would like first to inform the gentleman from Montana who previously spoke in the well that there are many hands-on farmers throughout this country and especially in Missouri and northern Missouri that the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota would do a great deal of benefit for. These are farmers that are very diversified and they have 600-, 700-acre farms, some 800-acre farms, 400-acre farms, but they also produce soybeans, milo, corn, and wheat on all those farms. They sometimes even have cattle and pork production also. So it is very diversified. They are hands-on, family farmers. Under the Stangeland amendment they would be greatly benefited.

The amendment I am offering is for some of those farmers who have small wheat bases while they may have 200 acres of beans or 200 acres of corn in addition to that, have a small wheat base, and on the other hand, they may have a larger base of wheat, some of them, but have a smaller corn. I will offer the same amendment when we get to corn.

This amendment is not to just take care of hobby farmers but full-time, family farmers who have small bases. I have many of them in my district, and this is just to try to recognize the fact that these are not all hobby farmers. I will admit that many of them are. This amendment is to make sure that they, too, come within the purview of the Stangeland amendment which I strongly support.

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLKMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STANGELAND. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I think the gentleman's concern is adequately addressed in the Stenholm bases and yield provision of the bill. However, we have no objection to the amendment. I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLKMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, there is another aspect to this proposal that I think is

being more or less covered up by emphasizing targeting. That the amendment uses a statewide average price to determine the price at which the producer may buy back his commodity. In Missouri, the difference between the price of corn or wheat in northwest Missouri compared to the bootheel is 20 to 25 cents a bushel. It is a bad provision in this bill; using statewide averages. Some people—down in the bootheel, for example—could secure a loan under the program, get their loan money, and the next day sell it on the market for a quarter more in their area because the statewide average price is lower than the normal price in their area.

□ 1315

You cannot make a program work even as described that uses statewide averages. If we have such a program, it should use the backed-off price like ASCS uses for loan rates. It is not workable the way it is written.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will allow me to proceed, that has to be addressed in another part of the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. No, it is in this part of the bill. Your amendment is to the part of the bill that includes statewide averages.

Mr. VOLKMER. Yes, but not in this amendment. What we are trying to address is the targeting concept for targeting prices.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. It also includes the marketing loans.

Mr. VOLKMER. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STANGELAND] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN].

The amendment to the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and rise in opposition to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STANGELAND].

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the House will exercise the same good judgment it did last week by supporting the committee bill instead of attempting to rewrite on this floor what is an extremely complicated and difficult piece of legislation.

The particular substitute offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STANGELAND], I believe, would have been subject to a point of order as to the germaneness of the section on the marketing loan, had anyone chosen to raise that objection. Additionally, it brings together two very disparate



ideas. The first of these is the so-called targeting concept, which is highly different from the original amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN].

The problem with targeting is that it will not help only small farmers, or the family farmer. What constitutes a family farm depends very much on where in the country you are located. In that regard, the original Dorgan amendment would limit the entire support of the Government's farm deficiency payments to 12,000 bushels of wheat. In some areas that is not a family farm economic unit at all; it is below it.

Further, there is nothing in either the Dorgan amendment or the substitute to prevent large farmers, very large farmers, from taking advantage of the higher prices for the first 12,000 or 15,000 bushels of wheat by planting it instead of some other commodity which they now plant in large amounts. There is not a single feature of this so-called targeting amendment that limits its application to small- or medium-sized farmers. A very large corn, cotton, or soybean farmer could decide to plant wheat in order to get the benefit of this higher level of targeting. Indeed we may see some rather uneconomic, though perhaps personally advantageous, decisions made by some farmers' to change their farming patterns in order to benefit from this payment rate.

Second, the marketing loan is a concept that I think was explored in great detail in the Agriculture Committee and was rejected. Simply stated, the marketing loan, says that you can take out a production loan from the Government for a amount of money and then repay significantly less than the amount borrowed. Obviously that is a concept that has a great deal of appeal. I have no doubt we would all like to have similar opportunities in home mortgages and other loans to pass back to the Government whatever smaller share of the return of principle and interest the current price structure permits. I cannot quarrel with the motion that this is an innovative approach.

But let me say to those, like the gentleman from North Dakota and the gentleman from Kansas, who worry about these resources going to big producers that there is nothing in the marketing loan concept that prevents it from being taken advantage of by the larger producers in the country. Indeed it is exempt from the \$50,000 payment limitation which exists in all other programs. As a consequence it is an extraordinary opportunity for the largest farmers to take part in a program where they take out loans, and then, if the price conditions justify it, they pay back something less.

Again the amendment moves entirely in a different direction than the

gentleman in the well suggests. Practically speaking, it will, if anything, be a boon to larger producers.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have two things. No. 1, I want to say that the targeting in the substitute is not as draconian as the targeting in the Dorgan amendment.

Mr. FOLEY. I think I have made that clear.

Mr. GLICKMAN. It is \$4.50 for the 15,000 bushels and \$4 for anything thereafter. I seriously doubt whether people would make those kinds of judgments on what the gentleman is talking about, considering that the current target price is \$4.38 a bushel right now. So we are just talking about a maximum targeting price that is 12 cents a bushel more.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will just allow me to respond to that, it must be either one thing or the other. It either provides a big boon to the first 15,000 bushels of production or it does not. If it does not provide that much difference, then the gentleman's argument as to why it is necessary to help family farmers tends to weaken. If on the other hand, it does provide that big a difference, it will encourage production.

Mr. GLICKMAN. The gentleman is trying to create a greater distinction than I think is actually in the amendment. It is trying to provide some additional incentive for the first bushels of production, but it is not a gigantic additional incentive that would cause a person to change dramatically his farm operation.

Second of all, I would point out that later on in the bill, where we for the first time have a \$250,000 limitation on nonrecourse loans, I intend to offer, if this amendment passes, that same kind of limitation on these loans. So the gentleman's argument about the giant farmer being eligible for these kinds of loans would not be accurate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FOLEY was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that it certainly is accurate as regards this substitute. However, whether it is advisable to try and limit production cooperation to farms other than large farms or not is a philosophical issue.

One of the problems we have had in our agricultural programs is that to some extent they have excluded some of the larger producers from having an incentive to participate and thus help control production. In any case,

as offered now, there is no easy way to estimate the budget cost of a marketing loan because its only limit is the price at which the loan has to be repaid. Depending on where the prices go, it could involve a very large obligation of the Government just as it could involve a very large benefit to producers, regardless of size, in not having to pay back the full amount of their loans.

Also, I think the precedent that loans, as such, are not necessarily repaid to the Government, that there is a built-in forgiveness feature in the loan, is an awkward one to set.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, I would ask my chairman of the Subcommittee on Wheat, Soybeans, and Feed Grains, is it not true that in many of the agricultural areas where we have commercial producers, because of the cost, because of the low prices that they have been receiving, and because of efficiency, farmers have banded together in small companies, and would this not destroy that banding together of maybe three or four families who are trying to continue to farm? Would this not destroy that effort?

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will allow me to reclaim my time, I appreciate the gentleman's concept.

May I just make an additional comment before my time has expired? I have not been as severe about the effect of this amendment as I should be. I suggested that its only requirement was that 70 percent of the loan has to be repaid. I spoke in error, however. That is a provision in the other body. There is no restriction on these loans we are discussing. Wherever the price goes, that is the only obligation that the farmer has, and possibly the entire loan, technically 50 percent of it, or more, is subject to being forgiven. So I think the House had better consider how far it wants to go with this concept.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, in analyzing the bill in subcommittee and again in full committee, on this concept that was offered as an amendment, was there not some concern about allowing this marketing loan concept, as you have so amply pointed out?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. MARLENEE, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FOLEY was al-

lowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, was there no concern that when you allow absolutely no bottom, allow the price to go down and you pay back the loan at bottom, no matter where it goes down to, no matter what the market is, that means a great deal more budget exposure? Was there not a great deal of concern about that?

Mr. FOLEY. Yes, I think there is concern about the budget exposure. Second, it sends, I think, the wrong signal to farmers—that it removes them almost totally from any responsibility for production levels in the country because someone, theoretically, will protect them regardless of where the price goes.

Third, farmers would not have to worry that much collectively about getting the best price in the marketplace because theoretically the Government again becomes the guarantor through forgiveness of the loan.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee chairman is exactly correct.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman if this is so: One of the things we have loan programs for is to help spread the marketing out during the marketing year.

Mr. FOLEY. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Now, under this concept, the person who markets his grain right at harvest time, for example, gets the maximum amount of money that he is going to get from the Government, and he is penalized really for holding the grain another 6 months. He loses the storage, he ends up getting less or paying back more, because the statewide average price is going to be higher 6 months later into the marketing year.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman just yield on that point about the statewide average price? He has mentioned it twice. Will the gentleman yield for just one second to me?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GLICKMAN. It is the statewide average price as adjusted for each county in the State. That is in the bill. It is not in the amendment. That is in the bill, and I think that ought to be reflected in order to correct the record.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, on the gentleman's present point, I think he is right, that there is a tendency in this amendment to remove the normal

judgments that farmers would have to make about appropriate orderly marketing of the crops because again the loan itself is repaid only at current prices.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. So it really almost forces them, if they are not going to hold it until the end of the marketing season anyway and deliver it in lieu of the loan, it forces them to dump it right at harvest time.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, one of the things I want to say to the gentleman is that I do not know how farmers are going to react to this. It is a totally new concept.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield to my friend and colleague, the coauthor of the amendment, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STANGELAND].

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would just like to make a couple of points. First, the gentleman from Iowa expressed concern about the statewide price. This is found on page 68 under subsection (b) where that State price is adjusted to the county price. It is exactly the same as the way current loan levels are done.

Second, as far as evening out the marketing year, as far as the comments of the gentleman from Montana about the great costs are concerned, let me tell the Members that the price of wheat today is below the loan. Are the farmers marketing that wheat? Not if they can help it. They are holding it.

What are they doing with that wheat? They are forfeiting it to the Government, and there is cost of forfeiting that wheat to the Government. There is cost to the Government. We are paying the cost up front, putting that grain on the market and not putting it in Government storage.

We have had acreage reduction and other reduction programs for 3 of the last 5 years, and we have continually built up surpluses under the current program, and we will continue to build up surpluses unless we change the program. That is the key to this amendment. If we want to continue to build up surpluses, that is fine.

We talk about who this helps and who it supports. Let me tell the Members who it supports—87 percent of the wheat farmers in this country, better than 87 percent. And it does not support the higher 14 or 15 percent. But who has been adding to those surpluses? It is those large wheat farmers who have been protected at the \$3.30 loan level while the market is about \$3, and because they can cash-flow that \$3 wheat, they plant fencerow to fencerow and they continue to build

up those surpluses. That is the problem we have.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I have the time, and I will reclaim my time. I would like to make my general statement in behalf of the marketing loan, and then I would be happy to yield to my chairman if I get additional time for any point that he might like to make.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. We have been discussing this farm program policy for better than 9 months now in the Committee on Agriculture, and we have been faced by a paradox of enormous irony—how to become market-competitive without marching an entire generation of farmers into bankruptcy.

This, I would inform my colleagues, is meant to be a little background as to how we got to the marketing loan. So how indeed do we accomplish that chore? Well, the Reagan administration, in its quest for a responsible farm policy, quotes almost daily from the free-market bible. In order to be able to compete, we must try to regain our place as a viable exporter of agricultural commodities. So when one loses one's comparative advantage due to embargoes, high deficits, the value of the dollar, unfair trading practices by our competition, foreign subsidies, and even worldwide weather patterns, we cannot be in the business of raising our support prices and compounding the felony. That is how the argument goes, and that is right as far as it goes, except for the fact that Uncle Sam has repeatedly sent the farmer out to do battle with one hand tied behind him.

We embargoed his product under the banner of foreign policy. We put him at the bottom of the high-deficit, strong-dollar export barrel. We gave his competitors foreign assistance. We passed a budget that increases defense spending and Social Security and all the rest of our entitlement programs, but the farmer has to take less than last year.

□ 1330

Now what about the other alternatives that we are hearing on the floor? Why not put all of our eggs in a basket called mandatory supply management? Under these programs we have several mandatory horses that are coming out of the chute, one even called voluntary-mandatory. We do not send the farmer into the free market boxing ring. We declare the free market null and void. We more or less let him choose whether or not to farm under Government determined price, a marketing quota and also a set-aside.



So what is the alternative? If it is not mandatory supply management, if it is not the free market, what is the alternative? I submit to you it is something called a marketing loan.

So to the administration I say there is no free market and your policy recommendations mean more of the same, misery and adversity in farm country.

To my colleagues who honestly believe they can shut down one-half of American agriculture at the expense of the other half and mandate a price to boot, well I respect your intentions, but there is one other commodity involved and that is called individual freedom, not to mention a host of long-term management and policy problems.

So what is the marketing loan? I would tell my colleagues there is a chart that I used in my 58-county tour when I traveled the big First District back in August. That is the district, by the way, that produces more wheat than any State in this Union. If you follow that chart where we get supposedly market competitive under the committee bill that has been explained so eloquently by my chairman, you ratchet down those loan rates, and sooner or later, by 1990, you become market competitive with, say, Argentina. And if you look at the price at the county elevator, that price would go to about \$2.10. At the gulf, it would be about \$2.60. We will be competitive all right. There will not be anybody out there to compete. That is nothing but slow death, or what I call Death Valley Days.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ROBERTS was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ROBERTS. So how do we compete? How do we become market competitive and still save that generation of farmers, not march them off of a cliff?

Well, the marketing loan is the best answer. With the marketing loan the price goes to the world level and you compete, you move the grain in that commercial pipeline. You do not store it. You do not pay that USDA estimated \$1.6 billion that taxpayers are going to have to pay. The farmer has to pay back that market price and then he is covered from that amount on up to the loan, and then he gets his target price deficiency payment as well.

The primary value of the marketing loan is that it does not ask the farmer to bear the full burden of becoming market competitive, especially when he has had no control over the forces that have led to the price and cash flow and credit prices we are experiencing.

It is budget conscious. It does fit under budget according to CBO, if you still believe CBO in this budget. And a special word for all my colleagues who want Uncle Sam to get tough on trade.

Do you want a level playing field for American farmers? Does the slogan "Buy American or Bye, Bye" appear in each and every paragraph of your speeches back home? This is your program. Under the marketing loan we will match our competitors dollar for dollar in terms of support for our farmers to win back export market shares. No more of this business of our competitors trying to produce more than we ask our farmers to set aside.

I would say to my chairman, the honorable gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY], yes, this is an odd couple. We are mixing some targeting and we are mixing the marketing loan, but it is a marriage of convenience because we come under budget. And I share your concern about targeting. I have big farmers just as well. But let me point out that under current law, the wheat base, when you hit the \$50,000 payment limitation is 1,440 acres. Under the committee bill, it increases to 1,650 acres, and under the Strangeland and Roberts and Glickman and Daschle and Dorgan plan, it is 1,765 acres. It is a wash. Targeting is a means to get the marketing loan under budget, and the marketing loan, as far as I am concerned, is the only way that we will get there from here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] has again expired.

(At the request of Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ROBERTS was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. First of all, let me say that I support the gentleman's proposal. The gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from Kansas have been the leaders in this effort.

There was some discussion about the fact that this was voted down in the committee. Let the record show that it was by the narrowest of margins that this amendment failed—I think it was one or two votes—in the full committee, and that it was agreed to as a discretionary item in the regular commodities section. So I do not think this thing has already been decided. It is going to be decided right here on the floor. It was a very close vote and it ought to be reexamined.

I think one of the good features about the proposal is that it is something different from the present program. And let us not forget that that is really what we are talking about. We are not really talking about this being a substitute for the gentleman

from North Dakota's amendment, but to the commodities section which is simply an extension of the present program that nobody likes. That is the real question. When we vote on this amendment, we are voting to change the present system. This is the only new initiative that we have in the commodities section. It is one that ought to be tried. The feature of targeting I think strengthens it, because it is those farms between \$40,000 and \$240,000 in total annual sales that are the ones under the most severe stress, not the big producers that somebody has been worried about here on the floor somehow taking advantage of this system. Less than 3 percent of them are under financial stress. But well over half of the smaller producers and mid-size farmers, people who look to their farm as their income source and not off farm income, those are the people this marketing loan concept will help.

So I support the concept. It is a new initiative. It is different from the present program that everybody admits ought to be changed. That is what we ought to be talking about, is this one versus the one that is in the bill now.

I appreciate the gentleman yielding. Mr. ROBERTS. I thank my colleague for his contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] has again expired.

(At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ROBERTS was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank my friend and colleague.

I want to make just a couple of very quick points. The gentleman from Washington indicates that we are going to have a lot of people moving out of one crop into another if this amendment passes. In the bases and yields section of the bill that was introduced by Mr. STENHOLM and myself, you can only do that to the extent of 20 percent. So there is a limit in that regard.

Now, what is not being said in this whole argument is what we do in the committee bill. Everybody knows that we have to lower that loan rate to become "market competitive." How do you do it? In the committee bill we give that discretion to the Secretary. You know the TV ad, "Let Mikey eat it. He will eat anything." Let the Secretary do it. We hand that job to the Secretary. Now if he does lower the loan rate, we can blame him for it if you are disposed in that way. If he does not, obviously we do not become market competitive. But if he does lower that loan rate, it goes from approximately \$3.30 down to \$2.47, the same kind of exposure with the marketing loan, only we don't say it, we do

it. We come up front. This is a come-clean effort. If in fact we are going to get market competitive, let us do it, let us get there from here. Let us do not go through that valley of death for 5 more years with the kind of adversity that we are facing in farm country.

I appreciate the gentleman seeking more time on behalf of this amendment.

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

I think there are a couple of points that we all ought to take a hard look at. The one thing that I have heard from my farmers, and quite frankly I have heard from virtually every member of the House Agriculture Committee, is that the wheat and feed grains section of the farm bill just has not been working. The point that my farmers have made time and time again over the past year is that we need a change, we need something different, we want to take a different approach. What we have been doing has not been working.

Well, I have to say that this particular section of the bill is pretty much the same old approach. There is some difference, but it is not something that I think my farmers are going to be very enthusiastic about, because it simply ratchets down the price year after year if the Secretary feels that is necessary in order to be competitive in the world market. In effect what that does is that the U.S. Government is calling the farmers, "We want to use your bank account. We want to use your wallet. We want to make certain that prices go down."

I think that what we have to recognize is that there are two ways of becoming competitive. It is a question of whether we are going to set a new lower price for the rest of the world to undercut, and that is what other countries have been doing. Other farmers, for instance the French farmers, are subsidized so that their wheat prices are much higher than here in America. I have heard reports that those wheat prices are over \$5 a bushel. My wheat farmers in Oklahoma are paid less than \$2.75. But that French wheat is getting sold because the French Government has made the commitment that they will make up the difference. They are in fact making certain that those French wheat prices are below whatever the United States farmer is selling his wheat for.

Many of us have had people from other governments who have come to us and told us that, "They really do not care what level we are selling our commodities, our wheat, they are going to undercut us a nickel. It comes out of their government's treasury. They feel that it is important that they keep their farmers on the farm."

I do not think that we should give those nations comfort. I do not think that we should tell them in advance what the U.S. minimum price is going to be, what the new floor is as far as the U.S. markets. Let them guess.

I think the only way that we can do that is to establish a method similar to the marketing loan so that the determination of what the world price will be is determined by the market. It is not going to be determined by the U.S. Government. And we are also assured that the American family farmer will not be bearing the entire burden.

So regardless of how you want to become competitive in the world market, I think we have to recognize that it is the U.S. Government that must step forward and stand shoulder to shoulder with the American farmer. Without question, the American farmer each time he steps beyond the boundaries of our shores has been getting mugged. After all, the American family farmer is the only farmer of a major exporting country in this world that goes out and has to compete in the world market, to compete against foreign governments.

So I would suggest to you that if you want to do something different, if you want a change, if you want to make certain that our competitors have guess for themselves what the new market price is going to be, then this approach is the way to go. It certainly is going to give the farmers an opportunity to vote either for this proposal or the Bedell proposal, a definite change in American agriculture.

I would also say that it is going to give us a chance to be competitive in the world market. It is going to give us a chance to provide some optimism for the American farmer—some light at the end of the tunnel.

Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if we could consider the marketing loan concept by itself, there might be a different sentiment reflected on the part of some Members of the House of Representatives. But because we are obliged to consider marketing loan and targeting together, some of us who might be sympathetic to at least giving the marketing loan concept some opportunity to be tried have to be against it.

In my case, there is a very simple reason why I have to be against it. The average corn farmer in Illinois under what is being proposed here would lose \$3,300 a year in cash. A farmer with a 500-acre corn base would lose \$3,300 a year in cash. He is going to lose money. That is not a big farm; that is an average farm in Illinois today. This is going to cause him to lose money. He has to make up that money somehow. They do not grow wheat now. But you have a provision

in what we are looking at now, and the corn thing is to follow what we are looking at now, you have a provision that says on the initial production of wheat, he is going to get a lot of money, and a provision in the bill that says he can switch 20 percent of his base to wheat. So to make up that \$3,300 that he would lose under your next proposal, the next one to be offered on corn that will be the same as this one on wheat, to make up what he would lose on corn he is going to switch 100 acres into wheat and get in on this very rich program that you have for the initial targeting on wheat.

Now you have never seen wheat until you have seen the amount of wheat that can be produced on some of that very fertile corn land in the Midwest where they do not grow wheat now. If you think you have a surplus problem, you have not got any surplus problem at all compared to what we will have when everybody with 500 acres of corn concerned with losing \$3,300 in cash decides to put 100 acres into wheat to get in on this thing you are advocating here. That is possible.

It is the next amendment. I am explaining to you why I am against the next amendment that would do to corn what this amendment does to wheat, and I am explaining to you the impact that that would have on the total production of wheat in this country, which serves only to make the whole problem, the whole surplus problem, much worse that it is right now, and clearly should illustrate to everybody why this was rejected in the committee and why the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY], the chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MARLENEE], the ranking member of the subcommittee, who represent wheat growers almost exclusively I believe, are against this proposition.

□ 1345

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADIGAN. I would yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MARLENEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, in addition, I would ask the ranking member of the full committee if the Farm Bureau supports this proposition?

Mr. MADIGAN. My understanding is that the American Farm Bureau does not support this idea.

Mr. MARLENEE. The wheat growers?

Mr. MADIGAN. The wheat growers do not support this idea. I am at a loss to say, other than perhaps the American agriculture movement, at a loss to name any organization that does support it.



Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MADIGAN. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MARLENEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding further.

Does the present committee bill protect farm income throughout the life of the bill?

Mr. MADIGAN. It maintains target prices at their current level throughout the life of the bill, and in addition to that, establishes the conservation reserve program of 25 million acres, which would take out of production, totally out of production, for a 10-year period of time 25 million acres presently in production.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. MADIGAN. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MARLENEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, much has been made, I would say to the ranking member, of the fact that we need to take a new direction; that this farm bill that we have crafted carefully in committee does not take a new direction.

Does not the present committee bill protect farm income and yet allow the grain—and this is the big point—allow the grain price to fluctuate downward to loan price so that it becomes market clearing and competitive on the world market, and is that not a new direction in farm policy?

Mr. MADIGAN. My understanding is that under the Foley-Marlenee provision agreed to by the full Committee on Agriculture, the loan rate would be allowed to go down 5 percent a year, with a snapback provision, and further would be allowed to go down, at the Secretary's discretion, on the order of what we call the old Finley amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BOLAND). The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADIGAN] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MADIGAN was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MADIGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MARLENEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Yes, it is true that the chairman of the Wheat Subcommittee, the ranking member of the Wheat Subcommittee, and the ranking member of the committee absolutely are opposed to the amendments that are being offered at this time and support the Foley-Marlenee provision.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADIGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to emphasize the point that is being made here. If you believe that a target price of \$4.38 during the last 4 years of the previous farm bill has not accumulated surpluses, then how can you say that a higher target price will not accumulate more surpluses?

The point being made here, I think, is that if we are looking at the total farm picture here in this country, we recognize that Government programs have dictated surpluses which have not only injured the taxpayer, but have injured the farmer throughout the existence of the farm bill. The committee structure recognized that, and it does something about it, and also brings us competitive in world prices.

The other point, I want to emphasize is simply that even though there is cross-compliance, if you have targeted wheat prices at this level, everybody in America will grow 15,000 acres of wheat, everybody. There are parts of this country where we can grow nothing but wheat; we have no alternatives. We have none. We cannot grow corn. We cannot grow soybeans. We cannot grow rice and cotton. We have one crop only. That is wheat.

What has been done in the past 4 years, the wheat production in this country has shifted. We are going to shift it again, this time to everybody with 15,000 acres, and I suggest that is social meddling. I suggest, again, the Government is trying to dictate how large farms ought to be, whether or not they ought to be family farms or something else, and I suggest this divides the country. This amendment divides the country into sections, and I think the committee bill does not do that. It recognizes that there are various parts of this country with needs and, therefore, I oppose the Glickman amendment to the Dorgan amendment.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, several things have been said in the last 5 minutes that need rebuttal.

The gentleman from Illinois made mention of the fact that the majority of Illinois corn farmers would be adversely affected. According to the statistics of the Department of Agriculture, 98 percent of all farmers in Illinois who grow corn would be favorably affected by this amendment. Those are not my figures. Those are Department of Agriculture statistics.

We are only dealing with wheat here, I might add, but nonetheless, I think it is extremely important that everyone realizes that when we are talking about benefiting the vast number of farmers today, this amendment would do so in ways that no other version of the bill can provide.

In fact, according to the Department of Agriculture 97.5 percent of wheat farmers and 98.1 percent of corn farmers would actually do better under this amendment than they would under the committee print. That point needs to be made first and foremost.

Second, it has been argued that this is a new concept. When it relates to agriculture, obviously this is a new proposal. But it is a proposal that is no different than progressive income tax or means tests which have been part of law for years. In addition, it attempts to change what we have had in policy over the last 20 years. Something that cannot be denied. The big have clearly gotten bigger at the cost of Government.

The last bushel of wheat produced by each farmer is not as important as the first bushel of wheat when it comes to the Government. Clearly it is in the Government's interest to put some emphasis on a certain amount of production by farmers, by producers, and to discourage additional production in the bill itself.

That is what we are trying to do here. To say that there is a law of diminishing returns, and at long last it is time that farm policy recognize that fact. We cannot, at the expense of Government, help the big get bigger.

There is one other point that I think must be made. Our producers in agriculture benefit from the direct subsidy. But there is a subsidy that we have not talked about on the floor at this point yet which I think is extremely important. That subsidy is found in the tax law.

Under tax law, the bigger you are, the more you benefit from the direct tax expenditures that are provided to large producers. As we try to phase out part of their direct subsidy, they will continue to have that additional amount of subsidization that comes from the tax law.

The last thing that I think is extremely important to reemphasize is the point mentioned by the gentleman from Oregon regarding the cross-compliance. The bill has a loophole that I think is extremely detrimental. As we try to put some tight constraints on supply control, there is nothing in the bill today that prevents a farmer from planting wheat where he once planted corn, and for planting corn where he once planted wheat. There is no provision on cross-compliance in the bill.

It is extremely important that if we are serious about bringing down the supply of both corn and wheat that we implement a cross-compliance feature, and this is the only amendment that addresses that effectively.

So for those reasons, progressivity, cross-compliance, the need to insure that we do not put the same value on a final product of wheat that we do on the first bushel of wheat, and the as-

surance that we all have that, according to the statistics of the Department of Agriculture itself, 98 percent of the farmers do better, I do not see that we can do any better than to pass this amendment on the floor this afternoon.

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DASCHLE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. STANGELAND. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to clarify a couple of misconceptions that I think are misconceptions as well.

First of all, it has been said that there is going to be a tremendous shift in production of wheat on corn land. We are offering 12 cents a bushel more on 15,000 bushels of wheat than the committee print does, and I cannot believe that there is going to be a vast exodus of corn acres to wheat acres for that 12 cents a bushel for those 15,000 acres. That is No. 1.

No. 2: It was alleged by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MARLENEE] that we were lowering the price support level over the life of this bill. Yes, we are, but so does the committee print. We lower our price support identical to what Foley-Marlenee does, and the committee.

So do not be misled that we are going to reduce the price more than the committee print does on that price support level.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE] has expired.

(On request of Mr. ENGLISH and by unanimous consent, Mr. DASCHLE was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. STANGELAND. If the gentleman will yield further, we are asking our farmers to be price competitive, and our farmers are in an economic situation not of their making.

First of all, they did not ask for the embargo of 1980. They did not ask for the high inflation rates of the late 1970's and early 1980's. They did not ask for the high interest rates. They did not ask for the strong dollar.

□ 1355

They are victims of an economy over which they have no control. And if they expect to be market competitive in the world market, and we expect our farmers to take that hit, we are going to see wholesale bankruptcies in agriculture.

So the market loan lets the Government take the hit, allows the Government to stand behind our farmers like foreign governments stand behind their farmers.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DASCHLE. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I wanted to point out that this is not a hastily drawn proposal. As people will note, there are Members on both sides of the political aisle who have stood up and said we would like to do something a little different. The point is that there are some who say let us keep doing what we are doing.

Does anybody here think that what we are doing is working? It is not. Prices are going down. Farmers are going broke. The cost of the programs are going up.

So people on this floor are saying, from both sides of the political aisle, let us try something different. Let us try a marketing loan concept. Let us try targeting. Let us see if we can turn this thing around.

That is what this debate is about. Some people would say, well, if we cannot provide the higher support price for the 2 or 3 percent of the producers in the country, most of whom are the largest corporate agri-factories in the country, then we do not want to try this new approach.

We cannot always do everything for everybody. We do not have the money. But we can do the right thing for the right people, and it seems to me as a matter of public policy that the right approach is to try and preserve the network of family farms in America. That is all we are trying to do.

To do that, we cannot continue doing what we have been doing because it has not been working. We have to try something different. That is what Republicans and Democrats who support this approach on the floor today are saying. Let us try something different because maybe there is a chance that it will work. Maybe there will be a brighter day for family farmers if we do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. ENGLISH, and by unanimous consent, Mr. DASCHLE was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DASCHLE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to follow up I believe on the statement that was made that somehow this bill was going to provide, or this amendment is going to provide additional incentives for people to go out and expand their production, and expand generally speaking.

I simply do not understand how in the world there is any logic in that particular kind of argument. What we are talking about here is providing an incentive for people to reduce their production, not increase their production, but to reduce it. The question is

how many people are going to participate in this program.

I think this measure offers an opportunity to increase the number of farmers who will actually participate in reducing their production and, therefore, bringing supply and demand into balance and, therefore, reducing the overall cost and offering farmers some hope that we are going to see better prices in the future. That is a very important point.

Second, with regard to those who say we are simply going to have a lot of other commodities that are going to switch over and start growing wheat or something else, the Stenholm provision of the farm bill would still remain in effect. Anybody that goes out and switches their crop, then only 20 percent of that, for instance, if it were wheat, would be eligible for the program, only 20 percent if they are going to be able to participate. That means 80 percent would not be covered by the program. I do not know of anyone who is willing to take that kind of risk. It would be a very great risk indeed.

Third, I think again there is a very bottom-line important issue to consider. Do we really want to adopt a policy of going out and driving down market prices in agriculture at this time? That is the real issue. Do we want to drive down market prices? That is what the bill provides for. It allows the Secretary of Agriculture to drive down by reducing the loan rate and saying here is where the U.S. price was at X. Now we are going to reduce it down here X minus 30 or whatever the number might happen to be.

That means they are going to have lower prices. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DASCHLE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to have technical changes made in the Stangeland-Glickman substitute to correct improper page and line references and delete lines that were inadvertently repeated. I send to the desk a copy of the amendment with the changes marked in ink.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modifications.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STANGELAND asked unanimous consent to have technical changes made in the Glickman-Stangeland substitute to correct improper page and line references and delete lines that inadvertently were repeated, as follows:

Mr. STANGELAND [during the reading]. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the technical changes be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.



The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. HUCKABY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, could the gentleman tell us what section of the bill this refers to?

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUCKABY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Chairman, this only has to do with this amendment, I respond to my good friend. It is just this amendment.

Mr. HUCKABY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment, as modified and as amended, is as follows:

Amendment, as modified and as amended, offered by Mr. STANGELAND as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota: Strike the amendment to page 70 in the Glickman (Dorgan as printed in the RECORD) amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(a) On page 69, line 5 before the "," insert the following: "except that the Secretary shall not make available payments under this paragraph to any producer with a wheat acreage base of less than 10 acres for the crop.";

"(b) On page 70, after line 18 striking all through page 71, line 18 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(C) For each crop of wheat, the established price shall not be less than the following levels for each farm:

"(i) \$4.50 per bushel for any portion of the crop produced on each farm that does not exceed fifteen thousand bushels, and

"(ii) \$4.00 per bushel for any portion of the crop produced on each farm that exceeds fifteen thousand bushels.";

Title IV of H.R. 2100 is amended by—

(a) on page 65, after line 15, striking all through "shall" on line 18 and inserting in lieu thereof the following—

"(2) If the Secretary determines that the availability of nonrecourse loans and purchases will not have an adverse effect on the program provided for in paragraph (3), the Secretary may";

(b) on page 67, line 12, striking "The Secretary may" and inserting in lieu thereof the following—

"(3)(A) Unless the Secretary, at the Secretary's discretion, makes available nonrecourse loans and purchases to producers under paragraph (2) for a crop of wheat, the Secretary shall";

(c) on page 68, after line 25, inserting the following new paragraph—

"(4)(A) The Secretary may, for each of the 1986 through 1989 crops of wheat, make payments available to producers who, although eligible to obtain a loan or purchase agreement under paragraph (3), agree to forgo obtaining such loan or agreement in return for such payments.

"(B)(i) A payment under this paragraph shall be computed by multiplying—

"(I) the loan payment rate; by

"(II) the quantity of wheat the producer is eligible to place under loan.

"(ii) For purposes of this paragraph, the quantity of wheat eligible to be placed

under loan may not exceed the produce obtained by multiplying—

"(I) the individual farm program acreage for the crop; by

"(II) the farm program payment yield established for the farm.

"(C) For purposes of this paragraph, the loan payment rate shall be the amount by which—

"(i) the loan level determined for such crop under paragraph (3); exceeds

"(ii) the level at which a loan may be repaid under paragraph (3)(B).

"(D) Any payments under this paragraph shall not be included in the payments subject to limitations under the provisions of section 1011 of the Food Security Act of 1985."

(d) on page 86, line 19, striking "may not" and inserting in lieu thereof "shall";

(e) on page 86, line 22, striking "may" and inserting in lieu thereof "shall".

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DASCHLE was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DASCHLE. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be some inconsistency, and I would like to ask the gentleman about this. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ENGLISH] said he thinks the policy is wrong that we take down the price, the market price of grain, and yet we heard the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STANGELAND], one of the authors of the legislation, say that it does exactly as the committee print does. I would like to have that corrected for the record, if you would.

Does not this amendment take the price down also as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STANGELAND] said?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Chairman, I reclaim my time, and since the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ENGLISH] made that statement, I will allow him to rebut that if he would be brief.

Mr. ENGLISH. I would be delighted to.

I think the point is the question of whether we are going to set a new low price, or whether or not the United States is going to be competitive in the world market. That is the real issue.

What the bill does today under the provision that you offered, it drives it down. It says, Mr. Secretary, the price is too high at \$3.30 a bushel, so we are going to let you set it at \$2.50 a bushel.

That now is setting it as far as the new minimum loan rate, and it tells the rest of the world that if you want to sell below that new minimum loan rate, or the new minimum U.S. price, all you have to do is sell at \$2.45.

I think we ought to keep some suspense in here if we are going to keep in the world market. Let us keep them guessing. Why should we set a new

minimum low price, and this provision take care of that.

Mr. DASCHLE. Let me reiterate in the little time that I have left to those watching the debate who are unclear about the ramifications of this amendment and what we are trying to do. First, we are trying to prevent the big from getting bigger at government expense. Second, we are trying to provide an opportunity for farmers to develop market orientation in this legislation. Third, we recognize that what has happened over the last 4 years has not been good for agriculture, that we are suffering a very severe crisis in farm credit and farm production, and clearly we have to do something different if we are going to bring ourselves out of the crisis we are in. And fourth, we can do it with less budget.

I do not think one can do any better than what this amendment is trying to do at any less cost to the Government. I believe that it certainly warrants the support of this House, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to advise my colleagues that we have a very difficult situation, as well as you can see from the debate here by the members of our committee.

But I have a responsibility, and I think we have a responsibility, to realize that this is a national problem, that the plight of rural America and the American farmer is a national problem that encompasses all regions, States—and every producer is impacted.

I want to remind my colleagues that this legislation is not a panacea, but it was very carefully debated and crafted. I have the responsibility to state to you that there are many areas of agriculture that are not impacted by this legislation. The fruit and vegetable industry, for example, is very important in my area. The only thing they get basically from the Government is harassment. If their crop fails, they get no assistance from Government. There is no loan. There is no target price.

We have to weigh that. It is not a single issue for a single area. You need to stick with the committee version because that was the sense of a majority of the members as to how we should proceed.

For example, somehow there is a concept that the family farm is ma and pa and the kids, and two hogs, and a few chickens and a cow. But let me tell you that went a long time ago.

So when you say you support the family farm, you must realize that a family farmer may own 100,000 acres. In some areas, this would be a big producer, but maybe not in another State,

maybe not in another region. But we are talking about the future of all American agriculture.

I will remind you that we could conceivably become an import-dependent Nation and we do not want this, especially in agriculture.

What farmers need is a price, not targeting. They need a price for their crop, and that is what we have to see that we do.

The current farm program is not working as well as we wanted it to, but other things disrupted it: the high value of the dollar, abnormal weather conditions, the high interest rates. If a farmer had a price for his crop, then he could make loan payments that are due, and this money is so very important to the community where he lives.

Now, under this marketing loan concept, you will be letting the rest of the world set the price. Yes; I would agree that where we set the loan has a tendency to set world prices also. But under this marketing loan concept, we would lose complete control. The farmer will sell his product at whatever low price is available and know the Government will still pay him a good price. This is bad policy.

And who is going to set the price? Our competitors. The price can be set every day. Our competitors around the world are going to look at our loan rate, and that is where they are setting their price? Not so.

If you turn it loose, they will set their price daily and our farmers will have no alternative but to sell. We will lose control of our input, as minimal as it might be, as to what the world price is going to be.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DE LA GARZA was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I also want to leave you with this thought: We do not know about this marketing loan. It is untried. It has not been utilized. We do not know if it will work.

The patient is too ill now to gamble. We have to stabilize his condition. I know of no better way to explain this than the time that I had an ailment called diverticulitis, and I had an attack, and they took me to the hospital. They said I was going to die. And the doctors had to then make the decision, do we do surgery or do we try to stabilize him?

Well, if they were to do surgery, then they read me the list of possible complications, and they left me to make the decision. There was no way that I was going to have surgery. They said they could try and stabilize my condition. But for a while, I thought, well, maybe if I am going to die anyway, it might as well be now.

But I decided against it because of the instinctive reaction of the body. So

they stabilized my condition. Three months later, I went and had the surgery and everything worked out fine.

And that is where we are now, if you will pardon me for using my own personal experience. It is now too risky to gamble. We do not know what the other nations are going to do. We do not know what other countries are going to do. And I tell you that we cannot lose control of influencing the price.

□ 1410

Under the amendment, we would give charity to a few small farms under helping the family farmer. But now is not the time to do that and I assure you that in my congressional district, the bulk are small and they are family farmers, but there is a tendency to say that the big should not participate in the American dream; that the big should not participate in the program, that only the small should participate. We call it a family farm to rationalize our concept that to us, philosophically, "big is bad."

We need to pass a bill that encompasses all American agriculture. We cannot put the big off on the side; we cannot let the little one fall by the wayside. This committee bill may not help all of them out there, but we have to stabilize the farm economy as best we can.

This is what the committee came up with. Yet, this amendment is a novel concept; it has not been tested. We cannot risk testing this concept now.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DE LA GARZA was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. DE LA GARZA. The Committee started with the premise to not drastically reduce the farmers' income and then see how we can sustain it as best we can.

So as enticing as the legislation sounds, as fervent as the plea is from those who support it, I submit to the Members, we must stay with the committee because the balance that is at stake is too dangerous to gamble with.

(On request of Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota and by unanimous consent, Mr. DE LA GARZA was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN].

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. The distinguished chairman, for whom I have the greatest respect, is worried that the largest producers in America might not be able to take advantage of the American dream.

I just want to say that they take advantage handsomely because 10 percent of the largest producers—

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Let me reclaim my time. I did not say that, and if it came out that way, I did not mean that; but there is a concept here that

"if you're big, you're bad" and this is what I am trying to negate.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. If the gentleman will yield further, let me just say that the 10 percent of the largest producers in the country now take 50 percent of the benefits in the farm program. We simply do not have unlimited money. The question is, how can we use our money the right way to provide the best support we can to the family farmers in the country? That is all we are trying to do.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. To support the committee version, that his how you can best utilize your money to help all of the farmers of America.

That is why I ask my colleagues to support the committee version of the legislation. We cannot gamble; it is too risky; we have tried and we can correct and have midcourse corrections; this would just be turned loose and then there will be no retrieving, regardless of what the consequences are.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADIGAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding and rise to associate myself with the very eloquent remarks of the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], and to remind the Committee of the Whole that not only the gentleman from Texas but also the gentleman from Washington (Mr. FOLEY), the chairman of the appropriate subcommittee, has also risen in opposition to this amendment, as has the ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MARLENEE].

I would like to say to my very distinguished friend from South Dakota, who argued with me about the statistics in Illinois, that I was referring to farms of 500 acres average size in Illinois, and said that specifically in my remarks. The information that the gentleman used from the U.S. Department of Agriculture referred to all farms in Illinois, and there are many hobby farms in Illinois, of 30 and 40 acres, and I am sure the gentleman would not want the Committee of the Whole to have been misled by the response that he gave to me.

Mr. DASCHLE. Will the gentleman yield on that score?

Mr. MADIGAN. I do not have the time; the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH] has the time, but perhaps he would yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DASCHLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Chairman, I have the statistics, and I think for the



record we might as well state them at this time.

We have 34,000 Illinois farmers whose farms have a base of 76 to 150 acres; we have 2,000 farmers in Illinois who have a base of 300 to 400 acres, and then we have 440 Illinois farmers with a base of more than 500 acres.

Mr. MADIGAN. If the gentleman will yield to me.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MADIGAN. I said an average of 500 acres, and I referred to that as the average working farm in my State, and I think the 76-acre farms clearly are not working farms, and I think that point has been made, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. I thank the gentleman, and may I just point out again and enunciate what I believe the chairman was describing. A question I want to leave in everyone's mind about this substitute is, what does it do about the overall surpluses in America of wheat and later in feed grains; what does it do to the non-subsidized commodities that are still out there; and much of agriculture is non-subsidized, there are just a few commodities, and what does it do to other subsidized crops?

The question I come back to again is the problem that you have in this bill, identified by the gentleman again from South Dakota, is that there is no cost compliance in this issue, in this measure, and that is dangerous because that means that you can move from one commodity to another without penalty.

The \$50,000 limitation differentiates between big and little; that still is in the bill, you can receive no more than \$50,000 deficiency payments. Plus the fact that everybody in America, tomorrow morning, can go and produce 20 percent of their acreage in wheat under this proposal, and the next year we can move 10 percent of our commodities around to produce wheat.

So the point is everybody is going to produce wheat. If corn follows this, everybody that has produced anything else, will also produce corn, because it appears that corn and wheat are the most profitable government subsidies. Remember this program moves us to farm the government. Our program approved by the Committee was trying to move farmer income from the Government to the market place.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADIGAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just think we need to repeat at this point a point that was made earlier by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MARLENEE].

When we talk about these figures from the U.S. Department of Agriculture; the size of this and the size of that and the size of something else, we

are talking about ownership; we are not talking about operating farms.

As the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MARLENEE] said a while ago, operating farmers rent as many as four pieces of farmland in order to put together an amount of land sizeable enough of them to make a living.

When we talk about somebody having 76 acres, we are talking about ownership; we are not talking about operating farms, and I think that point made earlier by the gentleman from Montana needs to be repeated when we try to calculate who benefits and who gets hurt by these kinds of things.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. I yield to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MARLENEE].

Mr. MARLENEE. I thank the gentleman for those comments and I thank my good colleague from the State of Oregon for yielding.

If we would go over the 1982 Agricultural Census, we would see that various categories in the number of wheat producers, and we note that there are 309,000 producers who produce under 150 acres.

(On request of Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MARLENEE. I note that there are 66,350 who are 150 to 300 acres. Well, if we take those two categories, the first one and say well, these basically are absentee or who produce wheat as a sideline, we can set that 309,000 producers aside. They are absentee or else they are producers who produce wheat as a sideline.

Then we take the 66,000 and we divide that, and we have about 33,000 who are actual hands-on producers. They are 150 to 300 acres. That is where targeting is targeted for; 33,175. Add up all of the rest of the wheat producers, all of the rest of them, and you come up with 70,000 wheat producers in this Nation.

□ 1420

And, maybe, that is why, maybe that is why the National Wheat Growers do not support this concept nor do the Wheat Producers of Montana or any other bona fide group like the Farm Bureau.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. DASCHLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

For clarification, was it the gentleman's point that we do not in this amendment deal with supply control any more effectively than what is in the bill?

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. I am suggesting under the Stenholm provision approved by the committee that we still have the opportunity to move 20 percent of one crop to another, and are likely to do so because of an increased subsidy by the Government of the United States. If everybody did that in America, we would be growing wheat in more surplus than we are growing it now. That was my point.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. DASCHLE and by unanimous consent, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. DASCHLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I only say that first of all that that is what this amendment does too. This amendment does not change that. So as far as the comparison goes, we are dealing with exactly with regard to the same size farm as we were dealing with in that particular issue.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Reclaiming my time, and then I will yield. This amendment does make those charges. It raises the target price, it makes producing wheat more attractive, it moves people to grow wheat, and it will move people to grow corn.

Mr. DASCHLE. Yes; but the point that I have to make in regard to that is that the gentleman's understanding is that we have cross compliance here which prevents them from going to wheat, which prevents them from going to corn from another crop.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Reclaiming my time, it does not prevent them from initially moving 20 percent to wheat.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I want to clarify a couple of points because it has been raised on several occasions by opponents of this amendment that somehow this targeting provision is a big bonus to doctors, lawyers, and other absentee owners. It is not.

If you look at this in a fair manner, you will discover that those kinds of farmland owners are not benefited in any degree by this measure that is not also available to them under the current law or under the Foley-Marlenee proposal. So it is not as if this is a big windfall to those kinds of landowners.

Second, the question was asked by the gentleman from Oregon, what do we do under this approach with the current surplus? One thing we do not do is add to the current surplus under

this approach, because under the marketing loan concept that grain is going to move. We are not going to turn it over to the Government at a huge cost the way we have under current programs and the way we will continue to under the Foley-Marlenee program.

We need a new approach in agriculture. That is the key argument in favor of this concept.

We do not save our farm economy by giving them the same old program.

The chairman of our committee argued a few minutes ago that this is not the time to try something new, that we want to stabilize the farm situation. No, we do not want to stabilize the farm situation because today the farm situation is deteriorating at a rapid rate. We need to do a better job of protecting farm income than we are doing under current circumstances and current programs and a better job than we would do under the Foley-Marlenee approach.

The marketing loan and the targeting concepts included in this amendment give us a chance to do a better job.

First of all, it gives us a chance to improve our market competitiveness. You know, a lot of people here say they want to make agriculture competitive, they want to have it market oriented. But when you offer them the only plan that will really get us market competitive, then they shy away from it, then they say we have to have income support at certain levels so we do not let that market price drop too low.

If we want to find out where that market will really go and how much of that market we can have, the marketing loan program gives us that opportunity. Then to make sure that you do not lose farmers in the process, let us give them a decent target. Let us not give them the same old target price, let us give them better target protection if we can.

This approach, as proposed by Messrs. STANGELAND, DASCHLE, DORGAN of North Dakota, GLICKMAN, and others, gives us a chance to move that target price up on the first level of production so that a small- and mid-sized family operator has an opportunity for a better price. Targeting makes an awful lot of sense from the budget standpoint as well. Keep in mind we are spending far less under this bill than we have been spending under current policy. I believe we ought to target those program benefits so that the small- and mid-sized family operators get the best income protection. Again, the only targeting that we have available is through the adoption of this amendment.

Last but not least, the issue in agriculture is a better price. We need to have a price if we are going to offer hope for our family farmers. Look at what happened to price in just the last

year. I know this amendment only addresses wheat, but I want to compare what has happened on corn as well because there should be a similar amendment to this adopted when we take up the corn provisions.

But on wheat a year ago in August, the price for wheat was \$4.60; this August, just a month ago, it was \$3.60. For corn, a year ago it was \$3.24; this past August it was \$2.58. That price is continuing to drop. Farmers' income is going down. We know that under the best approach we are not going to restore the kind of markets we need in order to get the market price up within the immediate future. That means we have to do something through targets or loans to give the farmers a better income than under a current farm programs. We offer one possibility under the Bedell amendment that will be debated later. The Bedell provision gives farmers a referendum vote to raise their price through a loan approach, and keeps us competitive in the world market by using our existing surplus in a bonus-bushel export plan. But if we want the fallback to that referendum to be something better than the current farm program, to provide us better income protection than the same old stuff for another few years, then I think we have to adopt this Stangeland-Glickman amendment, because under this amendment with a marketing loan and targeted payments to the family farmer in the small- and mid-sized category, we are going to provide better income protection.

If that referendum fails, I want a better fallback plan, and this marketing loan concept with its targeting provisions provides us that.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the time. There has been a lot of discussion going on back and forth about this and other approaches to the wheat title of the farm bill. I certainly respect what the chairman indicated, that we should come with a program that fits closer to the farm bill as reported by the committee. I believe that is the direction to take.

However, there are some portions in that which a number of us do not support, a number of us would like to see some other objectives.

I am not going to go into the argument of why this may work better than some others. I think there are two or three basic points I would like to make to my colleagues in the House. No. 1, I do not believe that given the budget constraints that we have in trying to deal with the farm program we are going to come up with a program that everybody in this body is going to support. I wish that were the case. I do not think we are going

to come up with a program that every farm group, no matter whether we can read off lists of this group supports this program or this group supports that program; that is not really the criterion, in my opinion. What we need, in my opinion, to look for is a program which will provide some income protection to the farmer, a program which will provide the opportunity for us to remain competitive in the export markets. I think it is vital that we continue those. I think it is vital that we do not lose those market opportunities in other countries. But I think it is also vital that we do not put that on the back of the farmer. I think in the current situation that is the case. We are causing and creating the farmer to have to finance our competing in foreign markets. Let us put it back on to the administration, and let us deal with that from the level rather than trying to leave it with the farmer.

I believe it is a significant and important matter that we continue to do these markets, and in my opinion this is the best approach that we can reach both of those goals.

Additionally, I do not believe this bill gouges or hurts the end user of the commodity, the livestock, or dairy producers, or others who have so much at stake, with the market so low that we have to keep competitive. Certainly it is important to the price of beef and to the price of milk that they be able to buy extremely competitively. Certainly the farmer needs to have more of an income. But I do not believe we need to leave that totally on the backs of the farmer.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COMBEST. I would be happy to yield to the chairman of the full Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I do not say this in a derogatory way, but the gentleman is emphasizing that you are putting it on the back of the farmer. Not so. We are sharing now. We are having a difficult problem.

But one of the worse problems in our area and in the area of the gentleman is when we are going to balance the budget. That is the most that we can do for the farmer besides giving him a price, is to balance the budget. This market clearing amendment, here you are letting the world set the price and you are putting the costs then on the taxpayer. What we do here is not all agreeable to a lot of people. That is why I say we have to stick with the committee, because editorial after editorial about the big price the farmers are getting, we know it is not so. So the gentleman uses perhaps the wrong phraseology here that you are going to take it off the back of



the farmer; you are going to put it on the back of the taxpayer without control, without limit. We have to do a balancing act.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. COMBEST. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I think the point I am trying to make is under current conditions and I think under many of the programs that we are looking forward to under the proposal as it comes from the committee is going to reduce that price potential to the farmer. I think that is where he has to be protected. As I am sure the chairman knows over many years of dealing with agriculture, you look at the end of the year to see whether or not you made a profit based on what the Government program has been, based upon what the price one had received in the marketplace. You add them up, and if you received more than you paid out, then you have made a profit, certainly. But I think it is also very important to note that throughout this entire type of a farm policy what we have done is we have used artificially high levels to set prices which some foreign countries can immediately come below and drive us out of that market and force the farmer into putting his commodity into storage. Certainly previous programs have not worked, we have continued to build up surpluses, we have continued to do that at the expense of the taxpayer, at the expense of the farmer because of the pricing it has. In my opinion, what it would do is to give that farmer that income protection which he needs, it would also give us an opportunity to move that commodity into the foreign markets to compete in those countries that are highly subsidizing their exports. And, yes, sir, Mr. Chairman, there is a level at which the taxpayer participates in the farm commodities. That has been the case for many, many years. I think it will continue to be the case for the next several, certainly if we are going to come out from under this program and out from under the problem.

The main point I would have to make is, I think we have to do something in the short term, not keep the status quo in agriculture but to do something that may be somewhat different because in my State the prices are so severe that we cannot let it fall simply as it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBEST] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota and by unanimous consent, Mr. COMBEST was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COMBEST. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First of all, I think the gentleman made an excellent statement, and I think he said it very clearly. I just wanted to point out to those who suggest that this is a budget problem, this approach, we are all familiar with budget problems; Lord knows, the cost of the farm program in recent years has exploded on us. And despite the fact that we have spent more and more money, we have not solved this problem. We have record farm failures. This approach is not a budget buster. In my judgment, this approach is the first step down that road to begin solving the farm problem and getting off the budget the kind of resources we have been spending in recent years, most of which, incidentally go to the largest producers from the pockets of the American taxpayers.

The farmers want a price, and they can either get it from the marketplace or from the Federal budget. We prefer the marketplace. In the short term, this approach is the right approach from the budget standpoint. This does not break the budget. The old approach breaks the budget. I think this approach is a first step toward solving our problem for the farmers and for the Federal budget.

And I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. COMBEST. The gentleman makes a very good point.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBEST] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. DE LA GARZA and by unanimous consent, Mr. COMBEST was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman makes a very good point and one which, as is indicated, comes within the budget. And that is the reason for the targeting. We may have some problems with the way that is handled. I do not like targeting.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COMBEST. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, very briefly, we have heard so terribly much that we need to level the field here, we need a level playing field. This marketing concept, they reduce, they reduce, they reduce, they reduce, because our farmer then will just get it from the Federal budget and we will be at their mercy. Where will we wind up? Where will be the price that we leave for our farmers? Where will we be in 2 years, 3 years?

I have to think of the farmer to the end of this century, not in the next election or next year or 3 years. We have got to look to see how we can stabilize it in the long term. If we leave this to the vagaries of other countries,

knowing that we are going to sell at any rate, then they will just go under and go a lot under where we would be. What have we done to stabilize the price for the farmer at the end? Nothing.

□ 1435

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBEST] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. COMBEST was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. COMBEST. I appreciate the Chairman's concern, and I think we have the same concern for the farmer. I also want to look into the future. My concern is that the alternatives that are there short of the marketing loan approach is not going to leave us with any alternative because, in my opinion, in the out years we are not going to have many people involved in agriculture.

(On request of Mr. FOLEY and by unanimous consent, Mr. COMBEST was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COMBEST. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Committee will consider very carefully before it votes to support this substitute.

We are troubled in our agriculture today by an enormous overproduction. It is part of a worldwide overproduction problem that is driving down the price of grain and creating public management and expense problems throughout most of the exporting agricultural world.

We have a \$2 billion-plus wheat crop today. In considering this amendment, we could be taking a step which I hope we do not take, that of providing so much protection to the farmer that all marketing decisions will be swept away, there will be almost a total guaranteed Government signal to produce, produce, produce.

There is a set-aside requirement in all of these bills. However the fertilizer that will be plowed into wheat acreage throughout this country to maximize production will create additional huge problems in the management of our public surpluses, that will be devilish in the future. This is a well-intended but bad amendment. It was rejected by the committee. It is opposed by the chairman of the committee, by its ranking minority member, by the chairman of the subcommittee and my colleague, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MARLENEE]. While I am for protecting the farmer this will create almost a total Government guarantee to the farmer, and in doing so, takes away all signals of restraint in production.

The farmer will have an opportunity under this amendment to get whatever protection the price will lead to. Under it there are no limits. It creates an entirely new, untrusted and untried system which I think reckons to put us in even worse condition on price, on surplus and on farmer income.

Secondly, the taxpayers of this country will not permanently support a plan to provide unlimited amounts of grain to be produced in the United States and exported for overseas use. Some restraint has to be adopted in the production of crops here and abroad if we are ever going to get a restored price. This tends to weaken all of signals to the farmers here and abroad and creates a problem which I think will be devilish in the future.

Under the circumstances and despite my respect for those who have offered them an amendment on both sides of the aisle, I hope the general membership will reject both the substitute offered by the gentleman from Minnesota and the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. COMBEST. I appreciate the gentleman's comments, and I know we are all very concerned about the direction of agriculture.

I would just simply say that this does, in my opinion, set up a supply management type program. It is voluntary mandatory, and I think it is one that will have some tremendous effects on actually what the result is. We are not setting ourselves up for the situation that will allow the Government to acquire and to take over great numbers of stocks because, simply, the program is a recourse loan rather than nonrecourse.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Washington made some excellent points in regard to this amendment. I would, though, point out that when it came up in the Committee it was defeated by one vote.

I wish at this point in time that we had done a little more cleaning up of this concept. We tried, and those of us who support it—and I intend to support this amendment today on the floor. I do so, in pointing out the gentleman from Washington made some arguments regarding the message that this bill sends or that this amendment sends. But I also rise at this point in time to encourage all members of this committee, particularly those on the House Agriculture Committee, to listen to the arguments that have been made in opposition to, as well as in favor of the market loan approach.

We are going to have another opportunity in just a few moments to discuss the so-called Bedell amendment. It is very interesting to listen to the debate today and to guess what lies ahead as we talk about yet another

concept. This one is not necessarily new. But I want to point out one thing. My name has been used quite often with the Stenholm base and yield bill, of which I take quite a lot of pride, with my friend, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] who worked so hard in this particular section of the bill, in which we have attempted to meet the market-oriented needs of agriculture in allowing flexibility of producers. This particular section does not affect that.

It has been suggested that somehow cross compliance has been brought in. And let me refresh everyone's memory. Cross compliance has to do with an individual farmer participating in, let us say, the cotton program up to the maximum amount allowed under the limitation of payments and then producing wheat on the rest of his farm and staying out of the program, and that is allowed. If this amendment passes, that will no longer be allowed.

If you are for effective supply management, you need to be for cross compliance.

What do we mean by effective supply management?

For the last year and a half, I have defined effective market-oriented supply management around three basic principles. The first is, the United States will no longer act as the world surplus disposing agent. No. 2, the United States will not subsidize its producers to overproduce. And, No. 3, the United States will act to protect farm income up to a certain point.

Today we are talking about targeting of benefits. That is another way of saying that the United States and this Congress is going to have to come to grips with the budget implications of farm bills.

Now, I do not particularly subscribe to the targeting as it is done in this bill. It has got some real problems, and there is no point in continuing the debate. Those who have opposed it based on that I think are correct. But let me sum up by saying the first point that I mentioned can further be defined by saying we should not give price windfalls to nonparticipants in farm programs. Under the current farm program, and those who have come before it, we will see that we continue to give benefits to nonprogram participants. That is a very major weakness of current farm legislation.

No. 2, we should not encourage expansion by foreign producers. I submit should this amendment pass today it is a message that needs to be sent to the rest of the world. We are going to get very competitive. We are going to hold the farmer harmless in regard to this particular issue. It is budget responsible. And that argument has been well made, because the cost of the loan, if the Government ends up assuming

that grain, that cost is paid by the same Treasury.

The third point that I would like to make to this argument is that we should avoid sudden demand shocks to agribusiness in rural communities, and this amendment proposes a certain amount of supply management. No question about that. It will not work any other way. In fact, I think it will be very effective supply management because it is truly a voluntary mandatory approach.

Now, you are going to hear in a moment those who argue that we ought to have mandatory controls. This one lets anybody produce. Anybody can farm, anybody can go out and raise all of the wheat that they particularly want to. They do not have to set aside anything if this amendment should pass. It is complete, total freedom.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. STENHOLM was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, it is complete and total freedom of an individual farmer to produce for that world market if he chooses not to participate in the supply management features that are a part of this amendment.

The last point that I would like to speak to in regard to this amendment and the one that is going to come later—because again I point out it is very interesting to listen to the debate for and against this amendment and to guess what is going to come when we get into the Bedell amendment. The chairman said a moment ago we should not gamble at this time. I am going to point out that same statement on Bedell, because it is one that we have got to think about. We spent a lot of time in the Agriculture Committee doing this. We should not continue the status quo in the farm bill.

We should serve notice to our foreign competitors that we will compete in terms of both price and supply.

Now, if that is what we really want to do, folks, this amendment is one way to do it. This is a good, quick way for us to get there.

So again let me point out, this does not have an adverse effect upon the base and yield section. It is still an integral part of the farm bill as I had hoped that it would be. Cross compliance is a separate issue that must be taken into consideration. It is a part of this amendment. Individuals need to make their minds up on that judgment based on your own opinion.

As I said, this is not a perfect amendment. The House Agriculture Committee has spent many hours of debate on this. The chairman is perfectly correct in saying that we should



not be rewriting farm legislation on the floor.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEREUTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has made a number of cogent arguments. This Member of the House has been particularly interested in agriculture export matters, and in that respect I think that the arguments that the gentleman has introduced for consideration by the House today are very persuasive to this Member. It is for this reason and many others already discussed that I support this proposal. This is a risk, in a proposal for a different approach it is true but there are much higher risk proposals before this body, on this body, and as part of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] has expired.

(On request of Mr. BEREUTER and by unanimous consent, Mr. STENHOLM was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BEREUTER. I frequently meet with our urban colleagues, and I know that they must be perplexed with the debate that is taking place here today, with the Agriculture Committee making recommendations and so many of its Members on both sides of the aisle advancing another proposal. But I say to these people, especially those that I meet with every week at 5 o'clock, on every Tuesday and Wednesday, for example that I want you to give very serious and favorable consideration to this Stangeland-Roberts amendment now before you offered by the distinguished gentlemen from Minnesota and Kansas, members of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. HUCKABY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HUCKABY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am very distressed with the gentleman's remarks that he sees no relationship or correlation between cross compliance and the bases and yields bill. I would like to point out to my colleagues, whether you are from North Carolina, Louisiana, or California, or any State where you produce more than one commodity, your average farmer is going to be penalized and penalized significantly if this amendment passes.

The gentleman from Texas and I worked out, with others, after many long months, an understanding on cross compliance, and now the gentleman seems to be saying, "I no longer stand by that agreement as such."

Mr. STENHOLM. The gentleman is totally correct. In the base and yield

section, as we worked it out, the gentleman is totally correct. But this amendment, if you are in favor of supply management, effective supply management, this amendment as offered is a way to get there. I do not argue at all with the gentleman's statement as far as what will happen to other areas and how it will affect other areas. I thought I made myself clear.

Mr. HUCKABY. If the gentleman will yield further, I would like to also point out that the initial bill before us, the Foley-Marlenee proposal, which is very similar to the Huckaby-Stangeland proposal in cotton and rice, provides for acreage reductions and supply management without these exotic new things that I agree with the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Washington, is going to cause more chaos and more confusion in agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. STENHOLM was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman made a very fine statement. I would certainly like to commend him for it. I would agree, as well, that this amendment does do much in moving in the direction of supply management. It applies to wheat and feed grains. That is where the principal problem is.

I would also like to take issue with the statement that was made earlier that somehow the higher target price for that first 15,000 bushels of wheat is going to increase production. I do not see how in the world that is true if we use a bushel basis. How in the world could you increase production over the 15,000 bushels on the acreage base that we already have? I think most of us would agree that the bushel basis is certainly going to be a much tougher method as far as supply management is concerned, and I would agree with his assessment that this measure does offer hope in reducing the amount of carryover and therefore provides some hope, some light at the end of the tunnel for farmers, so they can look forward to better prices each year as we move along instead of looking forward to a system that is going to drive down the market price year after year after year by reducing the loan rate. And that is what we are really down to.

Again, I want to underscore that one thing there seems to be unanimous agreement about and that is the program we have been operating under the last 4 years simply has not worked. This is a change. The question is

whether people want to change and move in a new direction or whether they want to stay with what has failed in the past 4 years.

Mr. STENHOLM. I might sum up my own remarks. I tried to make it very, very clear. There is a big difference in regard to the definition of cross compliance. The gentleman from Louisiana is totally correct in that. I thought I made my point extremely clear that if you are in favor of supply management, this is a way to get there.

I have got problems with two things about this amendment as offered. This is one of them.

The second point is the concerns that the gentleman from Washington brought up, and I have already summarized that. There is no point in going on.

I thank the House very much for indulging me this time in making these points.

□ 1450

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to refocus, if we can, on some of the fundamental facts that have gotten obfuscated in the discussion here this afternoon. I want to address my first remarks to the whole question of the targeting provisions in the bill.

I think it is important for us to understand the basic facts. The basic facts are that 5 percent of the farmers participating in the farm program get 39 percent of the total amount of money spent under the various commodity programs. Keep that point in mind: Five percent of the farmers get 39 percent of the money we are spending.

About 15 percent of the wheat program benefits go to 1 percent of the wheat farmers in this country. About 16 percent of the corn payments go to 2 percent of the corn farmers in this country. So let us keep that in perspective as we talk about the question of targeting.

The question is whether we can make this system fairer with respect to the distribution of the money—the limited amount of money—that we have to spend. I submit that the amendment that the gentlemen from Kansas and Minnesota and the other gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] are discussing here today, is a modest effort to address this fundamental problem of too few getting too much.

Any suggestion that farmers would dramatically increase their production of wheat, for example, because the target price would be raised from \$4.38 to \$4.50 as some of the previous speakers have suggested, just does not make a lot of sense to me. The other point

that I think needs to be responded to is the whole question of the set-aside requirements. The set-aside requirements in the amendment and the set-aside requirements in the committee bill are identical, there is no difference.

We have heard people say that if we adopt this targeting provision amendment that we are going to increase and encourage increased production. Let us look at that for just a second. The fact of the matter is that under the committee bill we are looking at a target price of \$4.38 for all production up to the limits of the deficiency payment and up to the limits of the loan. Under the amendment, for the 15,000 bushels of production, I will concede the target price will be a little bit higher, farmers would receive a little more income for the first 15,000 bushels of production. Twelve cents a bushel more.

Then what happens? After that point, the incentive is not to produce, because the target price drops a full 50 cents a bushel, 38 cents below what the committee bill is talking about. So for those people that are worried about whether this will actually encourage production, I contend clearly that it will not encourage production. I would argue that for those farmers that are producing more than 15,000 bushels of wheat in this specific example, it would discourage production.

Mr. Chairman, the other point I think we need to focus on is this question of whether corn farmers are going to reduce their production and then start increasing wheat production. Let us look at that for a moment. Under the targeting provisions that will be offered subsequent to this amendment, we will talk about the corn target price being raised slightly for the first 30,000 bushels of production. So I would contend that we are going to increase the incentive to produce for the early stages of production of corn which is going to decrease the incentive to switch to wheat or vice versa.

Mr. Chairman, I would conclude by saying that in the final analysis, what we are looking at here is a balanced approach. An approach that recognizes and responds to the desperate need to address the income problem that we have in rural America. It does that with both targeting provisions and with the marketing loan concept.

It also sends a powerful message to the international marketplace. We are telling our competitors around the world who are subsidizing their farmers that American farmers are going to be in the marketplace, in the international marketplace next year regardless how much they subsidize their production. I believe that will have a chilling effect on how much money the Europeans and other producers

around the world want to spend to subsidize their farm production.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLATTERY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FOLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman suggests that because he is going to have a corn targeting proposal it will not affect the transfer of acreage of corn to wheat. I would remind the gentleman that many corn farmers produce more than 30,000 bushels, and they would undoubtedly produce the first 30,000 bushels.

It might also encourage many producers who are now producing crops other than corn or wheat to move their crops to corn and wheat, since these crops will have special terms for the first 15,000 or 30,000 bushels.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY] has expired.

(On request of Mr. ROBERTS and by unanimous consent, Mr. SLATTERY was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. SLATTERY. Let us not confuse the basic facts. The facts are that for wheat, during the early stages of production, we will be encouraging that first 15,000 bushels of production under the amendment with the \$4.50 target price as opposed to the \$4.38 in the bill. Beyond the 15,000 bushels in production that may affect wheat farmers in Washington, the target price will drop 50 cents, and that will discourage additional production.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLATTERY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Kansas who has worked tirelessly on this amendment and whose knowledge in this area I deeply respect and I say that with all sincerity.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think that my colleagues can see that we have a division in the committee made of the establishment on one side and those of us who want to get there from here on the other. I must plead guilty.

Nine months ago, as the author of this convoluted and radical and very different departure from farm policy, I was meeting with Mrs. Stockman's very brilliant son, and we were trying out new ideas on how we could get there from here with profit and price into agriculture. I said what about a two-tier plan, and he said no. What about a bushel allotment plan and he said no. I said what about the current plan and he said no. I said what about the marketing loan and he said what is that.

We got our boot in the door. I do not think we can have it both ways. I would say to my very distinguished

chairman that the committee bill does freeze target prices at \$4.38. In terms of budget exposure, if you stop right there, yes, why we have less budget exposure. But also under the committee bill we give discretionary authority to the Secretary. We say, let him do it; let Jack Block do it. Then if he does that and he moves that loan rate down to \$2.47, that is outside the payment limitation and then you will have that same kind of budget exposure.

Now, under the marketing loan, if that price falls to \$2, you do make the payment from \$2 to that current loan; to \$3.14 all the way up to \$4.38. But you move the grain; you move the grain. You ask what will our competitors do? What are they doing now? If you put that loan down to \$2.50, they will sell it at \$2.47. If in fact this does not make sense that if the price goes to \$2 to move the grain and still protect the farmer up to \$4.38, what are we doing all this for? If the grain does not move at \$2, if we are not going to get market competitive and get there from here and end this 5-year agony, this "Death Valley Days" that the administration's projections show, if that is the case, if we cannot move the grain at \$2, then I would say to my chairman and to my distinguished colleague from Washington that the administration is wrong, the Farm Bureau is wrong, Mr. MADIGAN is wrong, the chairman is wrong, everybody in this body is wrong. I want to get there from here.

We have heard a long debate here on how we ratchet down the loan rate to become market competitive over a 5-year period. We will not have anybody left. Let us get there from here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY] has expired.

(On request of Mr. ROBERTS and by unanimous consent, Mr. SLATTERY was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. SLATTERY. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Chairman, in the remaining time I want to come back to the basic facts again. The basic facts with respect to this targeting amendment are these: No. 1 fact to focus on, do we want to continue to give 39 percent of the money that we are spending on these commodity programs to 5 percent of the farmers in this country? I say we should change this, and I say this amendment makes a historic first step toward addressing that problem.

Mr. HATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the chairman of the committee [Mr. DE LA GARZA].

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.



Mr. Chairman, I take this time to advise the Members that I think we have fully debated this amendment and we are ready to vote. But what I would like to leave my colleagues with is the thought that even though there are differences of opinions as to the philosophy or the thrust of the solution, we all agree the farmer is still in trouble out there.

□ 1500

Mr. Chairman, we need legislation, and the intensity of the debate is perhaps because of that. We have a disagreement basically, but we have no crystal ball. It is illusory at best that the grain will move. We started losing markets before the dollar started gaining strength and before the interest rates started going up, so it is hard to say that the grain is going to move. It may or it may not.

But the fact that I want my colleagues to understand is that we still have the problem. We still have the farmer in trouble. We need to address many issues. We need to bring down interest rates, keep inflation down, and reduce, if we can, the discrepancy between our currency and other currencies. So we cannot say that we will pass this amendment and all of a sudden everything is going to be bright and sunny and everybody out there is going to be buying our grain. No so.

I ask my colleagues to exercise some degree of caution. I hope they do not get too terribly confused with loan rates and target prices and marketing loans. If they are confused, I do not blame them. But the best thing Members can do under the circumstances is to stay with the committee version, stay with the leadership of the committee, because we have to remain together for the other parts of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, the best way to arrive at a final product is to go with the carefully crafted parts of the legislation, and I would hope that the Members will do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment, as amended and as modified, offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STANGELAND] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 200, noes 228, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 322]

#### AYES—200

Ackerman	Applegate	Atkins
Alexander	Armey	Barnes

Bartlett	Guarini	Regula
Barton	Gunderson	Ritter
Bates	Hamilton	Roberts
Beilenson	Hartnett	Robinson
Bennett	Hayes	Rodino
Bentley	Heftel	Roe
Bereuter	Hertel	Rogers
Berman	Hiler	Rostenkowski
Biaggi	Hopkins	Roth
Bliley	Howard	Sabo
Boniior (MI)	Hubbard	Savage
Borski	Hughes	Saxton
Bosco	Ireland	Scheuer
Boulter	Jacobs	Schneider
Boxer	Jenkins	Schroeder
Broomfield	Johnson	Schulze
Brown (CO)	Jones (OK)	Schumer
Bryant	Kasich	Seiberling
Burton (CA)	Kastenmeier	Sensenbrenner
Clinger	Kennelly	Sharp
Coats	Kildee	Shuster
Cobey	Kostmayer	Sikorski
Coble	LaFalce	Skeen
Coleman (MO)	Lantos	Skelton
Collins	Leach (IA)	Slattery
Combest	Leath (TX)	Slaughter
Cooper	Lent	Smith (FL)
Coyne	Levin (MI)	Smith (NE)
Crockett	Levine (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Dannemeyer	Lipinski	Snowe
Daschle	Loeffler	Snyder
Daub	Lujan	Solarz
Dellums	Luken	Stangeland
Dorgan (ND)	Lundine	Stark
Dornan (CA)	Markey	Stenholm
Downey	Martin (NY)	Strang
Durbin	Matsui	Studds
Dymally	Mavroules	Sweeney
Dyson	McCloskey	Synar
Eckart (OH)	McCurdy	Tauke
Edgar	McDade	Taylor
Edwards (OK)	McEwen	Torres
Emerson	McGrath	Torricelli
English	McKernan	Towns
Evans (IL)	McKinney	Traffant
Feighan	Meyers	Udall
Fields	Mikulski	Vento
Fish	Miller (OH)	Volkmer
Flippo	Molinar	Walgren
Florio	Moody	Walker
Foglietta	Mrazek	Watkins
Fowler	Murphy	Waxman
Frank	Natcher	Weber
Frenzel	Neal	Weiss
Frost	Nielson	Wheat
Gallo	Nowak	Whittaker
Gephardt	Oberstar	Whitten
Gingrich	Owens	Williams
Glickman	Packard	Wirth
Goodling	Pease	Wolf
Gordon	Penny	Wolpe
Gradison	Pepper	Wortley
Gray (PA)	Perkins	Yates
Green	Petri	Yatron
Gregg	Pursell	

#### NOES—228

Akaka	Carper	Donnelly
Anderson	Carr	Dowdy
Andrews	Chandler	Dreier
Annunzio	Chapman	Duncan
Anthony	Chappell	Dwyer
Archer	Chapple	Early
Aspin	Cheney	Eckert (NY)
AuCoin	Clay	Edwards (CA)
Badham	Coelho	Erdreich
Barnard	Coleman (TX)	Evans (IA)
Bateman	Conte	Fascell
Bedell	Conyers	Fawell
Bevill	Coughlin	Fazio
Bilirakis	Courter	Fiedler
Boehlert	Craig	Foley
Boggs	Crane	Ford (MI)
Boland	Daniel	Ford (TN)
Boner (TN)	Darden	Franklin
Boucher	Davis	Fuqua
Breaux	de la Garza	Garcia
Brooks	DeLay	Gaydos
Brown (CA)	Derrick	Geldenson
Broyhill	DeWine	Gekas
Bruce	Dickinson	Gibbons
Burton (IN)	Dicks	Gillman
Bustamante	Dingell	Gonzalez
Callahan	DioGuardi	Gray (IL)
Campbell	Dixon	Grotberg

Hall (OH)	Martinez	Rudd
Hall, Ralph	Mazzoli	Russo
Hammerschmidt	McCain	Schaefer
Hansen	McCandless	Schuetz
Hatcher	McCollum	Shaw
Hawkins	McHugh	Shelby
Hefner	McMillan	Shumway
Hendon	Mica	Siljander
Henry	Michel	Sisisky
Hillis	Miller (WA)	Smith (IA)
Holt	Mineta	Smith, Denny
Horton	Mitchell	(OR)
Hoyer	Mollohan	Smith, Robert
Huckaby	Monson	(NH)
Hunter	Montgomery	Smith, Robert
Hutto	Moore	(OR)
Hyde	Moorhead	Solomon
Jeffords	Morrison (CT)	Spence
Jones (NC)	Morrison (WA)	Spratt
Jones (TN)	Murtha	St Germain
Kanjorski	Myers	Stagers
Kaptur	Nelson	Stallings
Kemp	Nichols	Stokes
Kindness	O'Brien	Stratton
Kiecza	Oaker	Stump
Kolbe	Obey	Sundquist
Kolter	Olin	Swift
Kramer	Ortiz	Swindall
Lagomarsino	Oxley	Tallon
Latta	Panetta	Tauzin
Lehman (CA)	Parris	Thomas (CA)
Lehman (FL)	Pashayan	Thomas (GA)
Leland	Pickle	Traxler
Lewis (CA)	Porter	Valentine
Lewis (FL)	Price	Vander Jagt
Lightfoot	Quillen	Visclosky
Livingston	Rahall	Vucanovich
Lloyd	Rangel	Weaver
Long	Ray	Whitehurst
Lott	Reid	Whitley
Lowery (CA)	Richardson	Wilson
Lowry (WA)	Ridge	Wise
Lungren	Rinaldo	Wright
Mack	Roemer	Wyden
MacKay	Rose	Wyllie
Madigan	Roukema	Young (AK)
Manton	Rowland (CT)	Young (FL)
Marlenee	Rowland (GA)	Young (MO)
Martin (IL)	Roybal	Zschau

#### NOT VOTING—6

Addabbo	Byron	Miller (CA)
Bonker	Carney	Moakley

□ 1515

Messrs. GEKAS, DELAY, STUMP, RUDD, PARRIS, and RALPH M. HALL changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. ROBINSON, MATSUI, GUARINI, SWEENEY, FLORIO, MILLER of Ohio, BORSKI, FOGLETTA, SOLARZ, SCHEUER, DYMALLY, SCHUMER, and NEAL, and Mrs. COLLINS and Mrs. BURTON of California changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment, as amended, and as modified, offered as a substitute for the amendment, was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRANK AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DORGAN OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRANK as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota: Page 70, strike out line 19 and all that follows thereafter through page 71, line 19, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(C) The established price for wheat shall be \$4.38 per bushel for the 1986 crop; \$4.16

per bushel for the 1987 crop; \$3.96 per bushel for the 1988 crop; \$3.76 per bushel for the 1989 crop; and \$3.57 per bushel for the 1990 crop, respectively.

Mr. FRANK (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

□ 1530

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, I realize that this bill, in its short stay on the floor, has apparently already outlasted the membership's attention span, but this is a very important amendment which I choose to offer anyway.

This is an amendment which embodies the position of the Reagan administration on this particular bill.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would point out to the gentleman from Oregon that it is too late to reserve a point of order. The point of order has to be reserved before the gentleman from Massachusetts begins his remarks.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. If I may, Mr. Chairman, it was very difficult to hear. I did not even hear the amendment proposed and I was timely in my reservation of my point of order, Mr. Chairman. I was attempting to get order, as the Chair was. I suggest that I did not even hear the amendment offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair asked if there was objection to the waiving of the reading of the amendment and the Chair did not hear an objection.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, with due respect, I did not even hear the amendment offered, and it has never been read. I was standing here before you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would note that there were literally dozens of people standing. The Chair was not addressed by the gentleman from Oregon and there was a waiving of the reading of the amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK. I thank the Chairman, and I would repeat that I am sorry that this amendment, which embodies the position of the Reagan administration, has drawn the wrath of my friends, the gentleman from Oregon, on the other side. I did not mean to stir up any internecine warfare opposite by offering this position.

What this does is deal fundamentally with what seems to me to be the flaw in the agricultural programs. I voted for the past amendment that

was defeated. I wish it had been adopted.

I am concerned about small farmers and family farmers, but particularly with the defeat of that amendment and with other language in this bill which in fact Members should be aware increases, in fact, the amount that can go per farm. The limit we have had per farm is increased by this bill by some technicalities.

We have here the premier means-tested program in America. Under the agricultural program perpetuated by this bill, the more you got the more you get. The President himself noted in his radio speech on agriculture about a month ago that in the past 5 years we will have spent \$59 billion in agricultural subsidies, about 3 times more than we spent in the preceding 5 years. We are spending more on this than we are spending on AFDC and on food stamps. It is not only not means tested; it is antimeans tested. It is inversely means tested. The larger the farm, the more you get.

What this amendment does is embody the position of the administration, which says that the target price that we pay farmers for growing wheat for which there is no market—if there was a market for the wheat and it could be sold at a reasonable price, this would not arise—the target price that we are paying farmers for something for which there is no market would be frozen for this year but would then begin to drop 5 percent a year. The bill freezes it indefinitely in practical terms.

The position of the administration, with which I agree, is that we begin to drop it. The fundamental fact remains. Agriculture is the only profession in the country, to my knowledge, where we guarantee people to a certain extent the ability to stay there. We do not do it and should not do it with others. We do not guarantee to buy all the autos that are made or all the shoes that are made or all the shirts that are made. We are saying to wheat farmers, "Stay in business and we will buy all your wheat and we will pay you so much per bushel."

This does not amend that concept out of existence. It simply says that we will begin to reduce it by 5 percent a year. We continue to pay more people more money than we have to grow things that we do not need. I am in favor of methods of transition. Buy-outs, additional credit, efforts to ease people out of this business, I support. Continuing indefinitely to pay them more money than we have to produce what we have no conceivable market for is a mistake, and I congratulate the President on this position and I am proud to offer the amendment here.

This particular commodity, wheat, if we were to adopt this amendment drafted by the Department of Agricul-

ture, would save, according to the estimates of the Department, over a 5-year period, \$5.5 billion. We will hear a great deal about the deficit in general, but there is one problem with deficits. We cannot reduce them in general. We can only reduce them in particular, and this happens to be a very appealing particular. It would still leave large amounts of money being paid to wheat farmers, but it would begin to reduce it.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I have to confess I am a bit surprised to see the gentleman from Massachusetts sound reasonably serious in offering a proposal President Reagan sent to Congress, a proposal which was rejected by both sides of the political aisle in both bodies of the U.S. Congress, and suggest that he does so in the interest of helping family farmers.

I am disappointed, awfully disappointed, that the last vote did not prevail. I think we should target the farm program, but I will tell my colleagues that when we lost the last vote, that ought not persuade anyone in this House to rush toward President Reagan's proposal on agriculture. That is, in my judgment, a death sentence for thousands and thousands of family farmers across this country.

Is the gentleman serious about this proposal?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FRANK was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. FRANK. I am very serious about this proposal, although the context is difficult. A context in which the Committee on Agriculture tells us that we should continue, for instance, to build a fort out of butter in Kansas with Federal subsidies, sets a tone for the debate in which it is hard to be totally serious. But, yes, I am serious about this.

I am serious about trying to save \$5.5 billion and not perpetuating a situation in which we pay to the larger farmers more money. I did not argue that this particular amendment helps the family farmers. What I said was, I have supported earlier this year in the credit bill that was vetoed, in the gentleman's amendment which unfortunately was previously defeated, I have supported measures that have been targeted, but it is not now targeted.

What you are doing is taking billions of dollars and giving it out in a method which I know the gentleman agrees with me is not a fair one. I will continue to support efforts to target



this money better, and I will continue to support efforts to ease people out who want to get out. But to continue to pay—and I want to reiterate what I said before—in this bill because we drop the loan rate and do not drop the target price rate, we exempt in this bill apparently, and I use “we” here in the broadest possible sense, we exempt that additional amount that is going to result from the limitation.

So the result of the bill as it came out of committee is that the limitation per farm will be increased. We will be giving more to people. We heard the statistics before about who gets the money. The gentleman from Kansas talked about who got the money. This is an effort to reduce that money which is being sent out inequitably.

I will continue to support efforts to target, but we are continuing, I think, to send large amounts of money to people who ought not to need it.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. If the gentleman will yield further, I have known the gentleman from Massachusetts, I guess, for probably a dozen years and have long known of his interest in agriculture and his abilities in that area.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota and by unanimous consent, Mr. FRANK was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I just want to say that the reason the President's proposal on these price supports was just widely rejected and quickly rejected was that in the middle of a farm crisis, with farm prices dropping, with record farm failures, you do not begin to solve this thing by taking the price supports away and reducing prices. It is the wrong way to deal with this problem.

Mr. FRANK. The problem I have with the gentleman is, yes, I have known him for a dozen years, and for all those dozen years people in the Committee on Agriculture have been for increasing the programs, and we are told that a farm crisis is a bad time to cut them, and when we do not have a farm crisis is a bad time to cut them.

The fact is that the fastest growing, most inequitably targeted entitlement program in the United States are the agricultural programs. You get entitled to money. The more money you have, the more money you get, regardless of the effect on the budget, regardless of the effect on crops. It is *sui generis* in our situation, and I congratulate the administration for trying to bring some sense to it.

□ 1540

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Somebody just commented to me that when you find BARNEY FRANK and Ronald Reagan in agreement, either they are both crazy or they are both right, and I prefer to think in this case that the former is the truth rather than the latter.

I do not mean that. BARNEY is on my subcommittee, and at least I do not mean it with respect to BARNEY.

First of all, let us get the record straight. The current farm bill that we brought to the floor does not increase target prices. It freezes target prices, does not increase them.

So to vote for this bill is not voting for an increase in target prices. What the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. FRANK, talks about is decreasing by 5 percent a year the target price payments to farmers.

Before you do that, you have to do it in connection with what the current economic situation is out in America. The farm credit crisis is real, people are hurting, people are struggling, people are going broke.

Now the farm prices are reaching their depression-year lows right now in the market prices out there out in the country for wheat and corn, and soybeans, and livestock.

The farmers make their money in two ways. One is through the marketplace and one is through the Government, particularly in this period of time. What I think we all would like to see is for farmers to make their money through the marketplace, but right now if they rely exclusively on the marketplace, they are dead. Everybody in this room has gone out and given lip service to the farmers of America. Everybody has said how terrible it is that they are going broke, how bad it is that rural banks are going under, how bad it is that rural communities are in trouble.

If you vote for this amendment, you vote to accelerate the crisis that is occurring in rural America. And it is not just for the farmers, I would say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] but it is with the small towns throughout America that depend upon the agricultural economy to survive. It means small towns all over America will suffer more distress than they already do, it means that the farmers themselves will suffer that kind of distress.

So I am just saying to you that, yes, from a purely fiscal situation, we can save money by voting for the Frank amendment. But from a purely fiscal situation for farmers, you are going to bankrupt an awful lot of them.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLICKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK. First I want to say I did not assert that this bill increases target prices. What I said was there is

now in the law a \$50,000 per farm limitation on what a farmer could receive.

That is poverty assistance for you, \$50,000 per recipient, about 10 times the total AFDC payment.

What this bill does is allow you to go above that \$50,000, because it drops the loan rate and does not drop the target price, and it goes from the \$50,000 limit.

The second point I would like to make is that I am in favor of helping people in economic distress. But I have to comment on the grotesque inconsistency between voting the kind of cuts that have been voted to people in genuine need all across this country over the past four years, and voting for this bill which gives some help to people who are in need, but a vaster amount to people who are wealthy and above. This does not discriminate. This does not aim at the needy or the small farmer. However, the fact is that the bigger you are, the more you grow, the more money you get.

I would be glad to help respond to the problems that the gentleman is talking about. But this still throws all of the money to all of the people, and the wealthier, the bigger, the more solvent ones get more of the money than the others.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Unfortunately, I would say by this process, by cutting the target prices, you really cut the guts out of people that need it the most.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLICKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank my friend for yielding, and I want to associate myself with his remarks.

The reason that this amendment is being introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] is because I would not do it. I have more wheat than any other State in my district, and the administration came to me and said, “Won't you do the administration's bidding to get this under budget and to get a farm bill more market-oriented. Won't you freeze the target prices?” I said I just wished that we could freeze spending around here all across the board.

This target price is frozen for the life of the bill at \$4.38. It is under budget. I mean for those of you who still really believe in the current budget, and I have been saying for some time this farm bill is being held hostage to a budget process that is a failure, we cut \$11.8 billion in a special task force on the House Agriculture Committee to get to that level.

I would make one other point. This is direct income to farmers, yes, but also payment for embargoes, for market interference, for all sorts of things, a lack of contract sanctity, for the high deficit.

If this amendment passes, I would say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, it is going to be very similar to a salary or income freeze.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN] has expired.

(On request of Mr. ROBERTS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GLICKMAN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ROBERTS. If my friend will continue to yield, I would say to my friend from Massachusetts it would be like salaries and incomes to the Boston Red Sox held level and the New York Yankees have extra.

I would say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the average size farm in my district is 1,000 acres. That is not because we are big farmers, that is not because we are 6 feet 1 inch or belong to the Farm Bureau as opposed to somebody 5 foot 2 inches who is a small family farmer in Massachusetts. Our average size farm is 1,000 acres because we do not have the rainfall to do otherwise and be efficient. We have to have 1,000 acres. So if we leave the dock of supply management and we get into severe targeting, which is what the gentleman has recommended, we do make the farm program a welfare program. And I do not mean to perjure it in that sense. But this is no welfare program. This is designed to get the surplus down and the price up.

I would suggest to the gentleman that he has a great deal of blood pressure for those 250-acre-size farms with six cherry trees, four peach trees, a farm pond, two dogs, one with a wooden leg, and a whole bunch of cats. And I would say to the gentleman that that is fine, and that is the family farm if he wants to describe it. But that family farm has not been an economically viable operation to produce food and fiber in this country for over 30 years.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLICKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to inquire of my friend from Kansas what the position of the American Farm Bureau is on this amendment.

Mr. GLICKMAN. I do not know, but I assume that they are in favor of this amendment.

Mr. PEASE. I wondered about that, because I am a little bit puzzled. My understanding is that the American Farm Bureau Federation is in favor of a market-oriented approach which would allow the target prices to go up or down by 5 percent a year.

Now how is that consistent with the 5-year freeze?

Mr. GLICKMAN. I think the Farm Bureau is in favor of the Frank

amendment that allows a reduction in target prices. I do not know specifically.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLICKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, could I point out to my friend and colleague what the bill really says.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GLICKMAN was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. ROBERTS. What the bill really says is we freeze the target price for 2 years, and then we make a determination with a farmer cost-of-production board working in conjunction with the USDA that is on board right now to determine if the farmers' cost of production goes down. If that is the case, we can move those target prices down.

I might add that the chairman of that board just happens to reside in my district, and in regard to lowering land values and things of that nature that could very well occur, that was the gentleman's amendment, along with this gentleman's, to make sure we freeze it for 2 years, but if, in fact, the farmer's cost of production went down, then we could lower the target prices.

Mr. GLICKMAN. I would just make one point. I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [BARNEY FRANK] and anybody else here that there is kind of an implication that in a period of tough budgets that everybody should suffer, and I think that is true. But I want to tell you something. There are a tremendous number of people hurting as bad as they have hurt since the Great Depression right now in the midlands in America, and all throughout this country. And we are one family in this country, like when New York City was in trouble, and I like a majority of my colleagues helped that city out because I thought it would be an embarrassment to this country to see the largest city in this country in serious financial trouble. Our agricultural base is in serious trouble, and that is just not a statistic in the Washington Post. That is borne out by realities in bank failures, in suicides, in people who are hurting, in small towns closing up.

This amendment will help precipitate that.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLICKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, first I want to say to my friend from Kansas on the other side, he was apparently under the impression that I would be somehow worried about a freeze in the salary of the Boston Red Sox. I would. If it was my money, they would not

get nearly that much. If people want to pay them that much, that is OK with me. It seems to me they are probably substantially overpaid, but I have no problem with that.

Second, I would say to my friend here from Kansas, yes, I agree, for people in need, OK. But that is not what this bill does.

I appreciate what the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] said. He scoffed at the family farm. He said that is not for the family farm, it is to help a major industry that made some bad decisions.

I think we have to separate aid to individuals. Yes, I am for it. I voted for the farm credit bill. I voted for other things that would be helping those individuals.

This is a massive effort to continue an industrial policy for agriculture which says we will continue to subsidize people to grow, whether we need it or not. It does not begin to deal with the problem. It is not targeted and it is not aimed at people.

The gentleman from Kansas on the other side [Mr. ROBERTS] said that this is not a welfare program. Of course it is not. You know how you can tell? Because the people in it get too much money. We do not treat people on welfare that well. They do not get \$50,000 and more a year. This program in the bill says that the \$50,000 limit may have to be increased, and that is how you know it is not a welfare program.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Wait a second. It does not say that.

Mr. FRANK. It says if the loan rate is dropped below what it is now, it is the difference between the lower loan rate and the target price, and no one can be allowed to go above the \$50,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GLICKMAN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GLICKMAN. First of all, what it says is if we take action to lower the market price arbitrarily by lowering the loan rate, we will make up the difference to the farmer.

Mr. FRANK. More than \$50,000 a year.

Mr. GLICKMAN. The other point I think has to be said that by doing what you are doing, I do not think the gentleman voted for the last amendment—you did? I take it back and I appreciate the vote.

But what you are doing, what you are doing is you are cutting that target price for big farmers as well as small farmers, BARNEY, and you are not making any distinction yourself.

Mr. FRANK. If the gentleman would yield, I agree.

Mr. GLICKMAN. It is untargeted that way.



Mr. FRANK. And I want to make the distinction, but you are saying the arguments in favor of the amendment I agree with. They pointed out and persuaded me that a large share of the money now goes to the bigger people. I would not argue to help the AFDC problem by giving everybody in the State of New York a lot of money. That is what you are talking about, target it, aim it.

The gentleman from Kansas on the other side [Mr. ROBERTS] said forget about the family farm, this is the way to deal with the whole agricultural industry, and I think it is a very bad way.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to my colleagues that I can well understand the gentleman's concern for the administration's position. In 1983, he voted 17 percent, according to the Congressional Quarterly, with the Reagan administration. According to the Congressional Quarterly, in 1984 he voted 30 percent of the time with the Reagan administration. And this great concern he has about these target prices and the Reagan administration, I mean it puts a glow in my heart that the gentleman may be coming over to the Reagan position.

Now I also understand that this gentleman has a great concern about tariffs and import limitations which affect the great Northeast corridor, which are nothing more, and I would repeat are or would be nothing more than a tax on the consumers. It is very inconsistent to be talking about limiting help to wheat producers and then taxing consumers by increasing restrictions on imports that raise the price.

Why does my colleague from Massachusetts propose reducing targets? So that they can buy their product cheaper.

Well I say that the American farmer has sold his product cheap enough and long enough and to the point to where he is at the point of bankruptcy, as is evidenced from the problems in the Farm Credit System. Even the banks are going broke.

I would say that we must defeat this amendment so that we can put more income into the agricultural producers' pocket.

I thank the gentleman and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 93, noes 334, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 323]

## AYES—93

Ackerman	Fields	Miller (WA)
Anderson	Florio	Monson
Archer	Frank	Moorhead
Armey	Gallo	Morrison (CT)
Barnes	Gibbons	Mrazek
Bartlett	Gingrich	Nelson
Bates	Goodling	Nielson
Beilenson	Gradison	Owens
Berman	Green	Packard
Billakis	Gregg	Pease
Bosco	Hansen	Petri
Broomfield	Hunter	Porter
Carper	Ireland	Ritter
Carr	Jacobs	Schroeder
Chandler	Johnson	Schulze
Cheney	Kolbe	Shaw
Clinger	Kostmayer	Shumway
Cobey	Lagomarsino	Smith (NH)
Coble	Livingston	Snowe
Conte	Lowery (CA)	Solarz
Coughlin	Lujan	Studds
Courter	Luken	Swindall
Crane	Lungren	Thomas (CA)
Dannemeyer	Mack	Torricelli
DeLay	Markey	Vento
DioGuardi	Mazzoli	Walker
Dornan (CA)	McCain	Waxman
Dreier	McCandless	Weiss
Early	McCollum	Whitehurst
Eckert (NY)	McDade	Young (FL)
Fawell	McKinney	Zschau

## NOES—334

Akaka	Cooper	Gilman
Alexander	Coyne	Glickman
Andrews	Craig	Gonzalez
Annunzio	Crockett	Gordon
Anthony	Daniel	Gray (IL)
Applegate	Darden	Gray (PA)
Aspin	Daschle	Grothberg
Atkins	Daub	Guarini
AuCoin	Davis	Gunderson
Badham	de la Garza	Hall (OH)
Barnard	Dellums	Hall, Ralph
Barton	Derrick	Hamilton
Bateman	DeWine	Hammerschmidt
Bedell	Dickinson	Hartnett
Bennett	Dicks	Hatcher
Bentley	Dingell	Hawkins
Bereuter	Dixon	Hayes
Bevill	Donnelly	Hefner
Biaggi	Dorgan (ND)	Heftel
Billie	Dowdy	Hendon
Boehert	Downey	Henry
Boggs	Duncan	Hertel
Boland	Durbin	Hiller
Boner (TN)	Dwyer	Hillis
Bonior (MI)	Dymally	Holt
Bonker	Dyson	Hopkins
Borski	Eckart (OH)	Horton
Boucher	Edgar	Howard
Boulter	Edwards (CA)	Hoyer
Boxer	Emerson	Hubbard
Breaux	English	Huckaby
Brooks	Erdreich	Hughes
Brown (CA)	Evans (IA)	Hutto
Brown (CO)	Evans (IL)	Hyde
Broyhill	Fascell	Jeffords
Bruce	Fazio	Jenkins
Bryant	Feighan	Jones (NC)
Burton (CA)	Fiedler	Jones (OK)
Burton (IN)	Fish	Jones (TN)
Bustamante	Filippo	Kanjorski
Byron	Foglietta	Kaptur
Callahan	Foley	Kasich
Campbell	Ford (MI)	Kastenmeier
Chapman	Ford (TN)	Kemp
Chappell	Fowler	Kennelly
Chapple	Franklin	Kildee
Clay	Frenzel	Kindness
Coats	Frost	Kieccka
Coelho	Fuqua	Kolter
Coleman (MO)	Garcia	Kramer
Coleman (TX)	Gaydos	LaFalce
Collins	Gejdenson	Lantos
Combest	Gekas	Latta
Conyers	Gephardt	Leach (IA)

Leath (TX)	Panetta	Smith, Robert
Lehman (CA)	Parris	Snyder
Lehman (FL)	Pashayan	Solomon
Leland	Penny	Spence
Lent	Pepper	Spratt
Levin (MI)	Perkins	St Germain
Levine (CA)	Pickle	Staggers
Lewis (CA)	Price	Stallings
Lewis (FL)	Pursell	Stangeland
Lightfoot	Quillen	Stark
Lipinski	Rahall	Stenholm
Lloyd	Rangel	Stokes
Loeffler	Ray	Strang
Long	Regula	Stratton
Lott	Reid	Stump
Lowry (WA)	Richardson	Sundquist
Lundine	Ridge	Sweeney
MacKay	Rinaldo	Swift
Madigan	Roberts	Synar
Manton	Robinson	Tallon
Marlenee	Rodino	Tauke
Martin (IL)	Roe	Tauzin
Martin (NY)	Roemer	Taylor
Martinez	Rogers	Thomas (GA)
Matsui	Rose	Torres
Mavroules	Rostenkowski	Towns
McCloskey	Roth	Trafficant
McCurdy	Roukema	Traxler
McEwen	Rowland (CT)	Udall
McGrath	Rowland (GA)	Valentine
McHugh	Roybal	Vander Jagt
McKernan	Rudd	Visclosky
McMillan	Russo	Volkmer
Meyers	Sabo	Vucanovich
Mica	Savage	Walgren
Michel	Saxton	Watkins
Mikulski	Schaefer	Weaver
Miller (OH)	Scheuer	Weber
Mineta	Schneider	Wheat
Molinari	Schuette	Whitley
Mollohan	Schumer	Whittaker
Montgomery	Seiberling	Whitten
Moody	Sensenbrenner	Williams
Moore	Sharp	Wilson
Morrison (WA)	Shelby	Wirth
Murphy	Shuster	Wise
Murtha	Sikorski	Wolf
Myers	Siljander	Wolpe
Natcher	Sisisky	Wortley
Neal	Skeen	Wright
Nichols	Skelton	Wyden
Nowak	Slattery	Wylie
O'Brien	Slaughter	Yates
Oberstar	Smith (FL)	Yatron
Obey	Smith (IA)	Young (AK)
Olin	Smith (NE)	Young (MO)
Ortiz	Smith (NJ)	
Oxley	Smith, Denny	

## NOT VOTING—7

Addabbo	Miller (CA)	Oakar
Carney	Mitchell	
Edwards (OK)	Moakley	

□ 1605

Mr. COBLE changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to point out where we are. I offered the base amendment to try to target price supports.

That was substituted by the Stangeland-Glickman approach which included targeting price supports and the

marketing loan concept. We have had a rather substantial debate on targeting price supports. We lost this afternoon. I am very disappointed by that loss.

I wish we had targeted price supports because I think it was the right thing to do.

I had worked with Congressman GLICKMAN and others in the substitute that was offered to try to target these price supports. I supported that. I thought it was the right thing.

We are now left with the base amendment which I introduced, so that we could provide access to debate the Stangeland-Glickman amendment. I do not intend to seek a recorded vote on my amendment.

I did want to say this: that if the amendment does not prevail, inasmuch as we have had this debate this afternoon, the other body has taken action to target price supports. I am hoping the House of Representatives, as we move down this road toward conference, will still consider the interests of many of us in the House to target price supports. But I did want to take the floor to say that I do not intend, because of the debate we have had on the Glickman amendment and because of the result of that vote, to seek a recorded vote on my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOULTER

Mr. BOULTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOULTER: Page 75, line 9, strike out "July 1" and insert in lieu thereof "May 1".

Page 77, line 24, strike out "July 1" and insert in lieu thereof "May 1".

Page 79, line 6, strike out "July 1" and insert in lieu thereof "May 1".

Mr. BOULTER. Mr. Chairman, I have a very simple, straightforward amendment dealing with the announcement date for wheat. It is an idea I picked up in my town hall meetings in my district in Texas. If you all have wheat farmers in your districts and visit with them, you have heard the same thing. It would simply move the announcement date up from July 1 to May 1.

Mr. Chairman, the first thing I would like to do is explain my amendment which is desperately needed by wheat farmers in this country.

Each year the wheat program is announced for the following year allowing farmers to plan the next year's crop. The announcement includes program requirements for crop reduction and/or set-asides, as well as information on any plans for a paid diversion.

In my district and all of Texas, and indeed all winter wheat areas, the present July 1 date for the wheat program an-

nouncement is far too late to be of benefit to farmers.

Let me explain why, contrary to popular belief, the beginning of next year's crop starts on harvest day and not on planting day. In fact many farmers follow behind their harvesters with a plow that starts preparing the fields for the next crop. In winter wheat areas, harvest begins in May and usually ends by August. In Texas and surrounding areas 25 percent of the harvest is complete by June 1 and 75 percent of the harvest has been completed by July 1.

A typical farmer in my district will plow his field immediately after he has harvested his crop. In the next 6 to 8 weeks he will work his field to kill weeds, treat it for diseases, and fertilize the field. All this before planting. Planting starts in September.

Field preparation costs close to 70 percent of the total expenses that he will expend on his crop investment. With the current July 1 announcement date, decisions must be made without the benefit of knowing next year's program requirements: how many acres to prepare for planting, questions about fuel, chemicals, and labor costs, unnecessarily costing the farmer money.

As you can see, many farmers who harvest their crop before the announcement date have already invested time and money into a crop when they find out what the program actually will require.

The following organizations have endorsed my amendment: The Texas Wheat Growers, the National Association of Wheat Growers, The Texas Farm Bureau, The American Farm Bureau Federation, and the American Agriculture Movement. In addition, the National Farmers Union has endorsed moving the announcement date forward.

Mr. Chairman, I hope my colleagues will support my efforts to help the farmer do the job he does so well—feed America and the world. The Wheat Program announcement should be made in time for the farmers to make prudent decisions.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand the amendment of the gentleman, it would require the Secretary to make an announcement of the wheat program on May 1 but also allows him to amend it up to July 15.

Mr. BOULTER. Yes; we do not tamper with the current law which allows the Secretary to revise his estimates.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, we have examined the amendment on this side and have no objection to its adoption.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOULTER. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. Wheat producers are once again being forced to plant the winter wheat crop without knowing what the Government program will be next year. It seems, that it is a problem every year. When the process denies producers program decisions, they cannot make intelligent planting decisions.

Several years ago, I led an effort to mandate an early announcement of July 1. This was a vast improvement over the August 15 deadline that was in the law at that time. I commend the gentleman from Texas for taking the issue one step further and offering the May 1 deadline for the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the wheat program.

This amendment will provide the farmer with what he needs most—consistency and predictability and a better planning horizon to that he can make more rational business decisions on his cropping plans. As one producer told me recently, "Pat, I don't care what the USDA and the Congress do to me, just let me know." This amendment would let wheat producers know in time to make their decisions.

At the time, the House considered and passed the early announcement bill 2 years ago I argued for the May 15 deadline and the July 1 date was compromise. USDA made the valid point that sometimes the wheat supply picture changes so dramatically that a May announcement date would cause problems. The surplus is as great as ever, and it appears that we will be in a permanent state of surplus so I certainly don't see any problems with making that announcement date May 1, with the flexibility as the committee bill has to alter the program announcement if the wheat supply demand estimates change substantially.

I urge my colleagues to support the gentleman from Texas. His amendment is a good one.

I urge the House to adopt this amendment.

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOULTER. I would be happy to yield to my friend from Oklahoma.

Mr. ENGLISH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I join in support of the amendment. I think it is an outstanding one. It is certainly important to our part of the country in Oklahoma and Texas and all that region that we have an early announcement so that our farmers have some idea what the program is.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOULTER. I yield to my colleague from Texas.



Mr. COMBEST. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say I totally and fully support the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BOULTER] and appreciate the fact that he would take the initiative to do it. It certainly has strong support from the wheat producers in my district as well.

Mr. BOULTER. Mr. Chairman, several speakers have risen to say that the present date of July 1 is simply too late. Farmers generally follow their harvesters with the plow. They need the information in time. Seventy percent of their crop investment is made before the announcement date comes out. I might just point out in closing, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment is supported by the Texas Wheat Growers, the National Association of Wheat Growers, the Texas Farm Bureau, and the American Farm Bureau Federation, and the American Agricultural Movement, and the National Farmers Union have endorsed moving the announcement date forward.

□ 1620

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BOULTER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title IV?

If not, the Clerk will designate title V.

The text of title V is as follows.

#### TITLE V—FEED GRAINS

LOAN RATES, TARGET PRICES, DISASTER PAYMENTS, ACREAGE LIMITATION AND SET-ASIDE PROGRAMS, AND LAND DIVERSION PAYMENTS FOR THE 1986 THROUGH 1990 CROPS OF FEED GRAINS

SEC. 501. Effective only for the 1986 through 1990 crops of feed grains, the Agricultural Act of 1949 is amended by adding after section 105B (7 U.S.C. 1444d) the following:

"SEC. 105C. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"(a)(1) For any crop of feed grains for which a national marketing certificate program is not in effect under title V, loans and purchases shall be made available to producers as provided in this subsection.

"(2)(A) Unless the Secretary, at the Secretary's discretion, makes available loans to producers under paragraph (3) for a crop of corn, the Secretary shall make available to producers on each farm loans and purchases for each of the 1986 through 1990 crops of corn for an amount of corn of such crop produced on the farm equal to the acreage on the farm planted to corn for harvest times the farm's program yield for the crop. Loans and purchases under this paragraph shall be made available during each of the five marketing years for such crops of corn, beginning with the marketing year for the 1986 crop, at such level per bushel—not less than 75 per centum nor more than 85 per centum of the simple average price per bushel received by farmers (as determined by the Secretary) during the immediately preceding five marketing years, excluding the year in which the average price was the highest and the year in which the average price was the

lowest in such period—as the Secretary determines will encourage the exportation of feed grains and not result in excessive stocks of feed grains after taking into consideration the cost of producing corn, supply and demand conditions, and world prices for corn, except that the level of corn loans and purchases for a marketing year, including the marketing year for the 1986 crop of corn, may not be established under the foregoing formula at a level that is less than 95 per centum of the level of loans and purchases for the preceding marketing year (as determined before any reduction in the level of loans and purchases made under the following sentence). Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this subparagraph, if the Secretary determines (i) that the average price of corn received by producers in the previous marketing year (including the marketing year for the 1985 crop of corn) was not more than 105 per centum of the level of loans and purchases for corn for such marketing year, or (ii) that the loan level computed under the foregoing provisions would discourage the exportation of corn and cause excessive stocks of corn in the United States, the Secretary may reduce the level of loans and purchases for corn for the marketing year by the amount the Secretary determines necessary to maintain domestic and export markets for grain, except that the level of loans and purchases shall not be so reduced in any year to a level less than 80 per centum of the level of loans and purchases as determined under the preceding sentence. The simple average price received by farmers for the immediately preceding marketing year shall be based on the latest information available to the Secretary at the time of the determination.

"(B) Unless the Secretary, at the Secretary's discretion, makes available loans to producers under paragraph (3) for a crop of grain sorghums, barley, oats, or rye, the Secretary shall make available to producers under this paragraph loans and purchases for each of the 1986 through 1989 crops of grain sorghums, barley, oats, and rye, respectively, at such level as the Secretary determines is fair and reasonable in relation to the level that loans and purchases are made available for corn under this paragraph, taking into consideration the feeding value of such commodity in relation to corn and other factors specified in section 401(b) of this Act.

"(3)(A) The Secretary may make available recourse loans to producers during each of the five marketing years for corn, beginning with the marketing year for the 1986 crop, at such level per bushel—not less than 75 per centum nor more than 85 per centum of the simple average price per bushel received by farmers (as determined by the Secretary) during the immediately preceding five marketing years, excluding the year in which the average price was the highest and the year in which the average price was the lowest in such period—as the Secretary determines will encourage the exportation of feed grains and not result in excessive stocks of feed grains after taking into consideration the cost of producing corn, supply and demand conditions, and world prices for corn. The level of corn loans and purchases for a marketing year, including the marketing year for the 1986 crop of corn, may not be established under the foregoing formula at a level that is less than 95 per centum of the level of loans and purchases for the preceding marketing year. The simple average price received by farmers for the immediately preceding marketing year shall be based on the

latest information available to the Secretary at the time of the determination. The maximum term for any loan under this paragraph shall be 270 days.

"(B) The Secretary may make available to producers under this paragraph recourse loans for each of the 1986 through 1990 crops of grain sorghums, barley, oats, and rye, respectively, at such level as the Secretary determines is fair and reasonable in relation to the level that recourse loans are made available under this paragraph for corn, taking into consideration the feeding value of such commodity in relation to corn and other factors specified in section 401(b) of this Act.

"(D) A producer may repay a loan made under subparagraph (A) or (B) at a level (per bushel) that is the lesser of—

"(i) the original loan level; or

"(ii) at any time through the date of maturity of the loan that the producer redeems the feed grain under loan—

"(I) the then current State monthly weighted average market price (per bushel) for the feed grain, as adjusted for each county in the State, received by farmers, as determined by the Secretary; or

"(II) the then current State weekly or daily weighted average market price (per bushel) for the feed grain, as adjusted for each county in the State, received by farmers, as determined by the Secretary, if the Secretary determines that it is administratively feasible and reduces the fluctuation in the repayment market price for producers.

"(b)(1)(A)(i) The Secretary shall make available to producers payments for each of the 1986 through 1990 crops of corn, grain sorghums, oats, and, if designated by the Secretary, barley for which a national marketing certificate program is not in effect under title V in an amount computed as provided in this paragraph. Payments for any crop of feed grains shall be computed by multiplying (I) the payment rate, by (II) the farm program acreage for the crop, by (III) the farm's program yield for the crop.

"(ii) Whenever an acreage limitation program is in effect for a crop of feed grains, if producers on a farm devote a portion of the farm's permitted feed grain acreage (as determined under subsection (e)(2)) equal to more than 5 per centum of the farm's feed grain crop acreage base for the crop to conservation uses or nonprogram crops, such portion of the feed grain permitted acreage in excess of 5 per centum of the base devoted to conservation uses or nonprogram crops shall be considered as part of the farm's feed grain program acreage and the producers shall be eligible for payments under this paragraph on such acreage, subject to the producers' compliance with the next sentence. To be eligible for payments under the preceding sentence, the producers on the farm must actually plant feed grains for harvest on at least 50 per centum of the farm's feed grain crop acreage base. The farm's feed grain crop acreage base and feed grain program yield shall not be reduced due to the fact that such portion of the farm's permitted acreage was devoted to conserving uses or nonprogram crops.

"(iii) Other than as provided in clause (ii), payments may not be made under this paragraph for any crop on a greater acreage than the acreage actually planted to feed grains.

"(B) The payment rate for a crop of corn shall be the amount by which the established price for the crop of corn (less 6 cents per bushel if the Secretary establishes a feed grain export certificate program for the crop

under section 107F(a)) exceeds the higher of—

"(i) the national weighted average market price received by farmers during the first five months of the marketing year for such crop, as determined by the Secretary, or

"(ii) the loan level determined under subsection (a), before any adjustment made under the third sentence in subsection (a)(2)(A) for the marketing year for such crop of corn.

"(C) The established price for the 1986 and 1987 crops of corn shall be \$3.03 per bushel, and for each of the 1988, 1989, and 1990 crops of corn shall be a price determined by the Secretary that is not less than 110 per centum nor more than 125 per centum of the simple average price per bushel received by farmers (as determined by the Secretary) during the marketing years for the immediately preceding five crops, excluding the year in which the average price was the highest and the year in which the average price was the lowest in such period. The established price for a crop of corn may not be established under the foregoing formula at a level that is less than 95 per centum of the established price for the preceding crop of corn, nor may the Secretary set the established price for the 1988, 1989, or 1990 crop of corn at a level less than the level for the preceding crop of corn unless the Secretary certifies to Congress at the time the Secretary announces the program for the crop that the costs of production for such crop of corn for all producers, as estimated by the Economic Research Service of the Department of Agriculture in consultation with the National Agricultural Cost of Production Standards Review Board, will be 5 per centum below the cost of production for the previous crop of corn for all producers. The simple average price received by farmers for the immediately preceding marketing year shall be based on the latest information available to the Secretary at the time of the determination.

"(D)(i) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, if the Secretary adjusts the level of loans and purchases for corn in accordance with the third sentence in subsection (a)(2)(A), the Secretary shall provide emergency compensation by increasing the established price payments for corn by such amount as the Secretary determines necessary to provide the same total return to producers as if the adjustment in the level of loans and purchases had not been made.

"(ii) In determining the payment rate, per bushel, for established price payments for a crop of corn under this subparagraph, the Secretary shall use the national weighted average market price, per bushel of corn, received by farmers during the marketing year for such crop, as determined by the Secretary.

"(iii) Any payments under this subparagraph shall not be included in the payments subject to limitations under the provisions of section 1011 of the Food Security Act of 1985.

"(E) The payment rate for grain sorghums, oats, and, if designated by the Secretary, barley shall be such rate as the Secretary determines fair and reasonable in relation to the rate at which payments are made available for corn.

"(F) The total quantity of feed grains on which payments would otherwise be payable to a producer on a farm for any crop under this paragraph shall be reduced by the quantity on which any disaster payment is made to the producer for the crop under paragraph (2).

"(2)(A) Except as otherwise provided in subparagraph (C), if the Secretary determines that the producers on a farm are prevented from planting any portion of the acreage intended for feed grains to feed grains or other nonconserving crops because of drought, flood, or other natural disaster, or other condition beyond the control of the producers, the Secretary shall make a prevented planting disaster payment to the producers on the number of acres so affected but not to exceed the acreage planted to feed grains for harvest (including any acreage that the producers were prevented from planting to feed grains or other nonconserving crop in lieu of feed grains because of drought, flood, or other natural disaster, or other condition beyond the control of the producers) in the immediately preceding year, multiplied by 75 per centum of the farm's program yield for feed grains established by the Secretary for such crop times a payment rate equal to 33 $\frac{1}{3}$  per centum of the established price for the crop. Payments made by the Secretary under this subparagraph may be made in the form of cash or from stocks of feed grains held by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

"(B) Except as otherwise provided in subparagraph (C), if the Secretary determines that because of drought, flood, or other natural disaster, or other condition beyond the control of the producers, the total quantity of feed grains that the producers are able to harvest on any farm is less than the result of multiplying 60 per centum of the farm's program yield for feed grains established by the Secretary for such crop by the acreage planted for harvest for such crop, the Secretary shall make a reduced yield disaster payment to the producers at a rate equal to 50 per centum of the established price for the crop for the deficiency in production below 60 per centum for the crop.

"(C) Producers on a farm shall not be eligible for prevented planting disaster payments under subparagraph (A) if prevented planting crop insurance is available to them under the Federal Crop Insurance Act with respect to their feed grain acreage. Producers on a farm shall not be eligible for reduced yield disaster payments under subparagraph (B) if crop insurance on the growing crop is available to them under the Federal Crop Insurance Act with respect to their feed grain acreage.

"(D) Notwithstanding the provisions of subparagraph (C), the Secretary may make disaster payments to producers on a farm under this paragraph whenever the Secretary determines that—

"(i) as the result of drought, flood, or other natural disaster, or other condition beyond the control of the producers, producers on a farm have suffered substantial losses of production either from being prevented from planting feed grains or other nonconserving crop or from reduced yields, and that such losses have created an economic emergency for the producers;

"(ii) crop insurance indemnity payments under the Federal Crop Insurance Act and other forms of assistance made available by the Federal Government to such producers for such losses are insufficient to alleviate such economic emergency; and

"(iii) additional assistance must be made available to such producers to alleviate the economic emergency.

The Secretary may make such adjustments in the amount of payments made available under this subparagraph with respect to individual farms so as to ensure the equitable allotment of such payments among produc-

ers taking into account other forms of Federal disaster assistance provided to the producers for the crop involved.

"(c)(1) The Secretary shall proclaim a national program acreage for each of the 1986 through 1990 crops of feed grains. The proclamation shall be made not later than September 30 of each calendar year for the crop harvested in the next succeeding calendar year, except that for the 1986 crop the proclamation shall be made as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of the Food Security Act of 1985. The Secretary may revise the national program acreage first proclaimed for any crop for the purpose of determining the allocation factor under paragraph (2) if the Secretary determines it necessary based on the latest information, and the Secretary shall proclaim such revised national program acreage as soon as it is made. The national program acreage for feed grains shall be the number of harvested acres the Secretary determines (on the basis of the weighted national average of the feed grain program yields for the crop for which the determination is made) will produce the quantity (less imports) that the Secretary estimates will be used domestically and for export during the marketing year for such crop. If the Secretary determines that carryover stocks of feed grains are excessive or an increase in stocks is needed to ensure desirable carryover, the Secretary may adjust the national program acreage by the amount the Secretary determines will accomplish the desired increase or decrease in carryover stocks.

"(2) The Secretary shall determine a program allocation factor for each crop of feed grains. The allocation factor for feed grains shall be determined by dividing the national program acreage for the crop by the number of acres that the Secretary estimates will be harvested for such crop, except that in no event may the allocation factor for any crop of feed grains be more than 100 per centum nor less than 80 per centum.

"(3) Except as provided in subsection (e)(2), the individual farm program acreage for each crop of feed grains shall be determined by multiplying the allocation factor by the acreage of feed grains planted for harvest on the farms for which individual farm program acreages are required to be determined. The farm program acreage shall not be further reduced by application of the allocation factor if the producers reduce the acreage on the farm planted to feed grains for harvest from the feed grain crop acreage base established for the farm for the crop under title VI by at least the percentage recommended by the Secretary in the proclamation of the national program acreage. The Secretary shall provide fair and equitable treatment for producers on farms on which the acreage planted to feed grains for harvest is less than the feed grain crop acreage base established for the farm for the crop under title VI, but for which the reduction is insufficient to exempt the farm from the application of the allocation factor. In establishing the allocation factor for feed grains, the Secretary may make such adjustment as the Secretary deems necessary to take into account the extent of exemption of farms under the foregoing provisions of this paragraph.

"(d) The program yields for farms for each crop of feed grains shall be determined under title VI.

"(e)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"(A) Except as otherwise provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary may provide



for any crop of feed grains either a program under which the acreage planted to feed grains would be limited as described in paragraph (2) or a set-aside program as described in paragraph (3) if the Secretary determines that the total supply of feed grains, in the absence of such a program, will be excessive taking into account the need for an adequate carryover to maintain reasonable and stable supplies and prices and to meet a national emergency. The Secretary shall announce any feed grain acreage limitation program or set-aside program under this subsection not later than September 30 prior to the calendar year in which the crop is harvested, and the Secretary may make appropriate adjustments in such announcement for the feed grain acreage limitation program or the set-aside program not later than October 30 before the calendar year in which the crop is harvested, if the Secretary determines that there has been a significant change in the total supply of feed grains since the earlier announcement. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, the Secretary shall announce the feed grain acreage limitation program for the 1986 crop under subparagraph (B) as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of the Food Security Act of 1985.

"(B)(i) For the 1986 crop of feed grains, the Secretary shall provide for an acreage limitation program, as described in paragraph (2), under which the acreage on the farm planted to feed grains for harvest will be limited to the feed grain acreage base for the farm for the crop reduced by a total of 20 per centum, except that, for producers who plant the 1986 crop of feed grains before the announcement by the Secretary of the feed grain acreage limitation program for that crop, the Secretary shall provide for a combination of (I) an acreage limitation program, and (II) a paid diversion program, as described in paragraph (5), under which the acreage on the farm planted to feed grains for harvest will be limited to the feed grain crop acreage base for the farm for the crop reduced by 10 per centum under the acreage limitation program and by an additional 10 per centum under the paid diversion program.

"(ii) With respect to any of the 1987 through 1990 crops of feed grains, if the Secretary estimates, not later than September 30 of the year prior to the calendar year in which the crop is harvested, that the quantity of feed grains on hand in the United States on the first day of the marketing year for that crop (not including any quantity of feed grains of that crop) will exceed 1,100,000,000 bushels, the Secretary (I) shall provide for an acreage limitation program, as described in paragraph (2), under which the acreage planted to feed grains for harvest on a farm would be limited to the feed grain crop acreage base for the farm for the crop reduced by not less than 10 per centum, and (II) may provide for a paid diversion program, as described in paragraph (5), or an additional acreage limitation for any desired reduction in planted acreage in excess of 10 per centum of the feed grain crop acreage base for the farm.

"(iii) As a condition of eligibility for loans, purchases, and payments for any such crop of feed grains, the producers on a farm must comply with the terms and conditions of the acreage limitation program and, if applicable, the paid diversion program.

"(2) If the feed grain acreage limitation program is announced under paragraph (1), such limitation shall be achieved by applying a uniform percentage reduction to the

feed grain crop acreage base for the crop for each feed grain-producing farm. Producers who knowingly produce feed grains in excess of the permitted feed grain acreage for the farm shall be ineligible for feed grain loans, purchases, and payments with respect to that farm. The Secretary may provide that no producer of malting barley shall be required as a condition of eligibility for feed grain loans, purchases, and payments to comply with any acreage limitation under this paragraph if such producer has previously produced a malting variety of barley for harvest, plants barley only of an acceptable malting variety for harvest, and meets such other conditions as the Secretary may prescribe. Feed grain acreage bases for each crop of feed grains shall be determined under title VI. A number of acres on the farm determined by dividing (A) the product obtained by multiplying the number of acres required to be withdrawn from the production of feed grains times the number of acres actually planted to feed grains by (B) the number of acres authorized to be planted to feed grains under the limitation established by the Secretary shall be devoted to conservation uses, in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary. The number of acres so determined is hereafter in this subsection referred to as 'reduced acreage'. If an acreage limitation program is announced under paragraph (1) for a crop of feed grains, subsection (c) shall not be applicable to such crop, including any prior announcement that may have been made under such subsection with respect to such crop. Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b)(1)(A)(ii), the individual farm program acreage shall be the acreage on the farm planted to feed grains for harvest within the permitted feed grain acreage for the farm as established under this paragraph.

"(3) If a set-aside program is announced under paragraph (1), then as a condition of eligibility for loans, purchases, and payments authorized by this section, the producers on a farm must set aside and devote to conservation uses an acreage of cropland equal to a specified percentage, as determined by the Secretary, of the acreage of feed grains planted for harvest for the crop for which the set-aside is in effect. The set-aside acreage shall be devoted to conservation uses, in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary. If a set-aside program is established, the Secretary may limit the acreage planted to feed grains. Such limitation shall be applied on a uniform basis to all feed grain-producing farms. The Secretary may make such adjustments in individual set-aside acreages under this paragraph as the Secretary determines necessary to correct for abnormal factors affecting production, and to give due consideration to tillable acreage, crop-rotation practices, types of soil, soil and water conservation measures, topography, and such other factors as the Secretary deems necessary.

"(4) The regulations issued by the Secretary under paragraphs (2) and (3) with respect to acreage required to be devoted to conservation uses shall ensure protection of such acreage from weeds and wind and water erosion. The Secretary may permit, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, all or any part of such acreage to be devoted to sweet sorghum, hay and grazing, or the production of guar, sesame, safflower, sunflower, castor beans, mustard seed, crambe, plantago ovate, flaxseed, triticale, rye, or other commodity, if the Secretary determines that such production is needed to provide an adequate

supply of such commodities, is not likely to increase the cost of the price support program, and will not affect farm income adversely.

"(5) The Secretary may make land diversion payments to producers of feed grains, whether or not an acreage limitation or set-aside program for feed grains is in effect, if the Secretary determines that such land diversion payments are necessary to assist in adjusting the total national acreage of feed grains to desirable goals. Such land diversion payments shall be made to producers who, to the extent prescribed by the Secretary, devote to approved conservation uses an acreage of cropland on the farm in accordance with land diversion contracts entered into the Secretary with such producers. The amounts payable to producers under land diversion contracts may be determined through the submission of bids for such contracts by producers in such manner as the Secretary may prescribe or through such other means as the Secretary determines appropriate. In determining the acceptability of contract offers, the Secretary shall take into consideration the extent of the diversion to be undertaken by the producers and the productivity of the acreage diverted. The Secretary shall limit the total acreage to be diverted under agreements in any county or local community so as not to affect adversely the economy of the county or local community.

"(6) Any reduced acreage, set-aside acreage, and additional diverted acreage may be devoted to wildlife food plots or wildlife habitat in conformity with standards established by the Secretary in consultation with wildlife agencies. The Secretary may pay an appropriate share of the cost of practices designed to carry out the purposes of the foregoing sentence. The Secretary may also pay an appropriate share of the cost of approved soil and water conservation practices (including practices that may be effective for a number of years) established by the producer on reduced acreage, set-aside acreage, or additional diverted acreage. The Secretary may provide for an additional payment on such acreage in an amount determined by the Secretary to be appropriate in relation to the benefit to the general public if the producer agrees to permit, without other compensation, access to all or such portion of the farm as the Secretary may prescribe, by the general public, for hunting, trapping, fishing, and hiking, subject to applicable State and Federal regulations.

"(7) An operator of a farm desiring to participate in the program conducted under this subsection shall execute an agreement with the Secretary providing for such participation not later than such date as the Secretary may prescribe. The Secretary, by mutual agreement with producers on the farm, may terminate or modify any such agreement if the Secretary determines such action necessary because of an emergency created by drought or other disaster or to prevent or alleviate a shortage in the supply of agricultural commodities.

"(8) In carrying out the program conducted under this subsection, the Secretary may prescribe production targets for participating farms expressed in bushels of production so that all participating farms achieve the same pro rata reduction in production as prescribed by the national production targets.

"(f) If the failure of a producer to comply fully with the terms and conditions of the program conducted under this section precludes the making of loans, purchases, and

payments, the Secretary, nevertheless, may make such loans, purchases, and payments in such amounts as the Secretary determines to be equitable in relation to the seriousness of the failure. The Secretary may authorize the county and State committees established under section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to waive or modify deadlines and other program requirements in cases in which lateness or failure to meet such other requirements does not affect adversely the operation of the program.

"(g) The Secretary may issue such regulations as the Secretary determines necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

"(h) The Secretary shall carry out the program authorized by this section through the Commodity Credit Corporation.

"(i) The provisions of section 8(g) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (relating to assignment of payments) shall apply to payments under this section.

"(j) The Secretary shall provide for the sharing of payments made under this section for any farm among the producers on the farm on a fair and equitable basis.

"(k) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, compliance on a farm with the terms and conditions of any other commodity program may not be required as a condition of eligibility for loans, purchases, or payments under this section if an acreage limitation program is established under subsection (e)(2), but may be required if a set-aside program is established under subsection (e)(3)."

#### NONAPPLICABILITY OF SECTION 105 OF THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949

SEC. 502. Section 105 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1444b) shall not be applicable to the 1986 through 1989 crops of feed grains.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title V?

If not, the Clerk will designate title VA.

The text of title VA is as follows:

#### TITLE VA—PRODUCER-APPROVED WHEAT AND FEED GRAIN PROGRAMS

REFERENDA AND PRODUCTION ACREAGES, MARKETING CERTIFICATES, AND MINIMUM LOAN RATES FOR THE 1986 THROUGH 1990 CROPS OF WHEAT AND FEED GRAINS

SEC. 551. Effective only for the 1986 through 1990 crops, the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1461 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new title V as follows:

"TITLE V—REFERENDA AND PRODUCTION ACREAGES, MARKETING CERTIFICATES, AND MINIMUM LOAN RATES FOR THE 1986 THROUGH 1990 CROPS OF WHEAT AND FEED GRAINS

#### "FINDINGS AND POLICY

"SEC. 501. (a) Congress finds that—

"(1) wheat and feed grains are essential agricultural commodities for the Nation, are produced throughout the United States by hundreds of thousands of farmers, and along with their products flow in substantial amounts through instrumentalities of interstate and foreign commerce from producers to consumers;

"(2) abnormally excessive and abnormally deficient supplies of wheat and feed grains on the country-wide market acutely and directly affect, burden, and obstruct interstate and foreign commerce; and

"(3) interstate and foreign commerce in wheat and feed grains, and their products, should be protected from burdensome sur-

pluses and disruptive shortages, a supply of the commodities should be maintained to meet domestic consumption needs and export demand, and soil and water resources of the Nation should not be squandered in the production of surplus burdensome supplies of the commodities.

"(b) It hereby is declared to be the policy of Congress that it is in the interest of the general welfare to assist in the marketing of wheat and feed grains for domestic consumption and export; to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in the commodities to the extent necessary to provide an orderly, adequate, and balanced flow of the commodities in interstate and foreign commerce; and to provide loans and other means to maintain farm income for producers of the commodities, reduce excess production, and enable consumers to obtain an adequate and steady supply of such commodities at fair prices.

#### "CONSUMER SAFEGUARDS

"SEC. 502. The powers conferred under this title shall not be used to discourage the production of supplies of food and animal feed sufficient to meet normal domestic and export needs, as determined by the Secretary. In carrying out the purposes of this title, the Secretary shall give due regard to the maintenance of a continuous and stable supply of agricultural commodities from domestic production adequate to meet consumer demand at prices fair both to producers and consumers.

#### "WHEAT AND FEED GRAIN REFERENDA

"SEC. 503. (a) The Secretary shall conduct a referendum by secret ballot of wheat and feed grain producers every two years to determine whether they favor or oppose the national marketing certificate program under this title. In the case of the 1986 and 1987 crops, the referendum shall be conducted as soon as practicable after enactment of the Food Security Act of 1985, but not later than February 1, 1986. For the 1988 and 1989 crops, the referendum shall be conducted not later than July 1, 1987, and for the 1990 crop, year not later than July 1, 1989.

"(b) Any producer on a farm with a wheat or feed grain crop acreage base of fifteen or more acres for the then current crop, as determined under title VI, shall be eligible to vote in a referendum. For the purposes of this section, the term 'producer' shall include any person who is entitled to share in a crop of the commodity, or the proceeds thereof, because the person shares in the risks of production of the crop as an owner, landlord, tenant, or sharecropper. A landlord whose return from the crop is fixed regardless of the amount of the crop produced shall not be considered a producer.

"(c) The Secretary shall proclaim the results of any referendum held hereunder within fifteen days after the date of such referendum, and if the Secretary determines that 60 per centum or more of the producers of wheat and feed grains (including 50 per centum or more of the producers of wheat and 50 per centum or more of the producers of feed grains) voting in the referendum in favor of the implementation of a national marketing certificate program, the Secretary shall proclaim that a national marketing certificate program will be in effect for the crops of wheat and feed grains produced for harvest in—

"(1) with respect to the referendum held not later than February 1, 1986, the 1986 and 1987 crops of wheat and feed grains;

"(2) with respect to the referendum held not later than July 1, 1987, the 1988 and 1989 crops of wheat and feed grains; and

"(3) with respect to the referendum held not later than July 1, 1989, the 1990 crops of wheat and feed grains.

"(d) In the event that a national marketing certificate program is approved for the 1986 crops of wheat and feed grains, the Secretary shall provide fair and equitable compensation to producers who planted a crop in excess of their farm program acreage prior to the proclamation by the Secretary that marketing certificates will be in effect with respect to that crop. Such compensation shall cover, at a minimum, the costs incurred by the producer for planting such crop, as determined by the Secretary.

"(e) If marketing certificates are not approved by producers in a referendum conducted under this section with respect to any crop of wheat or feed grains, in lieu of a national marketing certificate program for that crop, the Secretary shall provide such loans, purchases, payments, and other assistance to producers of wheat and feed grains as provided for elsewhere in this Act.

#### "NATIONAL MARKETING CERTIFICATE PROGRAM—WHEAT

"SEC. 504. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if a national marketing certificate program for a crop of wheat is approved under section 503, the Secretary shall make available to producers on each farm loans and purchases for such crop of wheat for an amount of wheat produced on the farm equal to the acreage on the farm that may be planted to wheat for harvest, as determined under subsection (c) or (e) of section 107D, times the farm program yield for the crop, as determined under title VI. Loans and purchases shall be made available during the marketing year for any such crop of wheat at such level as the Secretary determines will maintain the competitive relationship of wheat to other grains in domestic and export markets after taking into consideration the cost of producing wheat, supply and demand conditions, and world prices for wheat, except that the level of wheat loans and purchases for any such marketing year may not be established at less than \$4.50 per bushel of wheat.

"(b)(1) The Secretary shall make available to producers marketing certificates for any of the 1986 through 1990 crops of wheat for which a national marketing certificate program is in effect. The amount of such marketing certificates made available to the producers on a farm shall equal an amount of wheat produced on the farm equal to the acreage on the farm that may be planted to wheat for harvest as determined under subsection (c) or (e) of section 107D, times the farm program payment yield for the crop, as determined under title VI.

"(2) A marketing certificate applicable to a marketing year issued to a producer of wheat shall authorize such producer to market, barter, or donate, without restriction, during such marketing year an amount of wheat equal to the amount of such marketing certificate. Wheat may not be marketed, bartered, or donated domestically without a marketing certificate, except that wheat not accompanied by a marketing certificate may be used for feed, human consumption, or other purposes on the farm of the producer, or may be sold for export.

"(3) Wheat accompanied by a marketing certificate that is sold for export shall be eligible for an export incentive payment on such wheat, as provided in section 1125 of the Food Security Act of 1985.

"(4) If for any crop, wheat that the producer harvests exceeds the amount of the



commodity that may be marketed, bartered, or donated under a marketing certificate, the excess may be carried over by the producer from one marketing year to the succeeding marketing year and marketed under a certificate in the succeeding marketing year to the extent that (A) the total amount of such wheat available for marketing under a certificate from the farm in the marketing year from which such commodity is carried over does not exceed the amount of the marketing certificate made available to the producers for that crop, and (B) the total amount of wheat available for marketing under a certificate in the succeeding marketing year (that is, the sum of the amount of such wheat carried over and the amount of such wheat produced on the farm eligible for marketing certificates in the succeeding year) does not exceed the amount of marketing certificates made available to the producers for the succeeding marketing year.

"(5) Marketing certificates made available to a producer of wheat shall not be transferable, except to the extent that such certificates accompany wheat that is marketed, bartered, or donated under paragraph (2).

"(6) Wheat harvested in a calendar year in which marketing certificates are made available to producers for the marketing year beginning therein may not be marketed, except as provided in paragraph (2), prior to the date on which such marketing year begins.

"(7) A person may not purchase or otherwise acquire an amount of wheat from a producer in excess of the amount of wheat that may be marketed, bartered, or donated by such producer under a marketing certificate, except that wheat that must be exported may be acquired as provided under paragraph (2).

"(8) If marketing certificates for wheat are not made available to producers for any marketing year, all previous marketing certificates applicable to wheat shall be terminated, effective as of the first day of such marketing year.

#### "PENALTIES WITH RESPECT TO WHEAT

"SEC. 505. (a)(1) Except as provided in subsection (b), if a producer fails to comply with any term or condition of a wheat program conducted under this title, the producer shall be ineligible for any loan, purchase, or payment under this Act for the crop of wheat involved.

"(2) Except as provided in subsection (c), if anyone markets, barter, or donates wheat other than for export without a marketing certificate required under section 504 or markets, barter, or donates an amount of wheat for use in excess of the amount of wheat the person or entity is permitted to market, barter, or donate under such certificate, the Secretary shall—

"(A) assess a civil penalty against such person or entity in an amount equal to three times the current minimum loan rate for the wheat so marketed, bartered, or donated, or

"(B) with respect to a producer, decrease the number of acres of the farm's wheat crop acreage base such producer may devote to production for the succeeding crop of wheat by a number of acres that, if planted, would result in the production of a quantity sufficient to satisfy the penalty referred to in subparagraph (A).

"(3) If a person knowingly purchases or otherwise acquires an amount of wheat in excess of the amount of wheat that may be marketed, bartered, or donated under a marketing certificate issued under this title, the Secretary shall assess a civil penalty against such person in an amount equal to three

times the current minimum loan rate for the wheat so purchased or acquired.

"(b) If a producer fails to comply fully with the terms and conditions of a wheat program conducted under this title and the Secretary believes the failure should not preclude the making of loans, purchases, or payments to the producer, the Secretary may make loans, purchases, or payments in such amounts as the Secretary determines to be equitable in relation to the severity of the program violation.

"(c) If the Secretary determines that the penalties provided for in subsection (a) are not warranted by the severity of the program violation, the Secretary may reduce or waive such penalties.

"(d) Penalties collected under this section shall be deposited into the account of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

#### "NATIONAL MARKETING CERTIFICATE PROGRAM—FEED GRAINS

"SEC. 506. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if a national marketing certificate program for a crop of feed grains is approved under section 503, the Secretary shall make available to producers on each farm loans and purchases for such crop of feed grains for an amount of feed grains produced on the farm equal to the acreage on the farm that may be planted to feed grains for harvest, as determined under subsection (c) or (e) of section 105C times the farm program yield for the crop, as determined under title VI. Loans and purchases shall be made available during the marketing year for any such crop of feed grains at such level as the Secretary determines will maintain the competitive relationship of feed grains to other grains in domestic and export markets after taking into consideration the cost of producing feed grains, supply and demand conditions, and world prices for feed grains, except that the level of feed grain loans and purchases for the 1986 through 1990 marketing years may not be established at less than \$3.25 per bushel of corn.

"(b)(1) The Secretary shall make available to producers marketing certificates for any of the 1986 through 1990 crops of feed grains for which a national marketing certificate program is in effect. The amount of such marketing certificates made available to the producers on a farm shall equal an amount of feed grains produced on the farm equal to the acreage on the farm that may be planted to feed grains for harvest, as determined under subsection (c) or (e) of section 105C, times the farm program yield for the crop, as determined under title VI.

"(2) A marketing certificate applicable to a marketing year issued to a producer of feed grains shall authorize such producer to market, barter, or donate, without restriction, during such marketing year an amount of such feed grains equal to the amount of such marketing certificate. Feed grains may not be marketed, bartered, or donated domestically without a marketing certificate, except that feed grains not accompanied by a marketing certificate may be used for feed, human consumption, or other purposes on the farm of the producer, or may be sold for export.

"(3) Feed grains accompanied by a marketing certificate that is sold for export shall be eligible for an export incentive payment on such feed grains, as provided in section 1125 of the Food Security Act of 1985.

"(4) If for any crop, feed grains that the producer harvests exceed the amount of the commodity that may be marketed, bartered, or donated under a marketing certificate,

the excess may be carried over by the producer from one marketing year to the succeeding marketing year and marketed under a certificate in the succeeding marketing year to the extent that (A) the total amount of such feed grains available for marketing under a certificate from the farm in the marketing year from which such commodity is carried over does not exceed the amount of the marketing certificate made available to the producers for that crop, and (B) the total amount of feed grains available for marketing under a certificate in the succeeding marketing year (that is, the sum of the amount of such feed grains carried over and the amount of such feed grains produced on the farm eligible for marketing certificates in the succeeding year) does not exceed the amount of marketing certificates made available to the producers for the succeeding marketing year.

"(5) Marketing certificates made available to a producer of feed grains shall not be transferable, except to the extent that such certificates accompany feed grains that are marketed, bartered, or donated under paragraph (2).

"(6) Feed grains harvested in a calendar year in which marketing certificates are made available to producers for the marketing year beginning therein may not be marketed, except as provided in paragraph (2), prior to the date on which such marketing year begins.

"(7) A person may not purchase or otherwise acquire an amount of feed grains from a producer in excess of the amount of feed grains that may be marketed, bartered, or donated by such producer under a marketing certificate, except that feed grains that must be exported may be acquired as provided under paragraph (2).

"(8) If marketing certificates for feed grains are not made available to producers for any marketing year, all previous marketing certificates applicable to feed grains shall be terminated, effective as of the first day of such marketing year.

#### "PENALTIES WITH RESPECT TO FEED GRAINS

"SEC. 507. (a)(1) Except as provided in subsection (b), if a producer fails to comply with any term or condition of a feed grain program conducted under this title, the producer shall be ineligible for any loan, purchase, or payment under this Act for the crop of feed grains involved.

"(2) Except as provided in subsection (c), if anyone markets, barter, or donates feed grains other than for export without a marketing certificate required under section 506 or markets, barter, or donates an amount of feed grains for use in excess of the amount of the commodity the person or entity is permitted to market, barter, or donate under such certificate, the Secretary shall—

"(A) assess a civil penalty against such person or entity in an amount equal to three times the current minimum loan rate for the feed grains so marketed, bartered, or donated, or

"(B) with respect to a producer, decrease the number of acres of the farm's feed grain crop acreage base such producer may devote to production for the succeeding crop of feed grains by a number of acres that, if planted, would result in the production of a quantity sufficient to satisfy the penalty referred to in subparagraph (A).

"(3) If a person knowingly purchases or otherwise acquires an amount of feed grains in excess of the amount of feed grains that may be marketed, bartered, or donated under a marketing certificate issued under

this title, the Secretary shall assess a civil penalty against such person in an amount equal to three times the current minimum loan rate for the feed grains so purchased or acquired.

"(b) If a producer fails to comply fully with the terms and conditions of a feed grain program conducted under this title and the Secretary believes the failure should not preclude the making of loans, purchases, or payments to the producer, the Secretary may make loans, purchases, or payments in such amounts as the Secretary determines to be equitable in relation to the severity of the program violation.

"(c) If the Secretary determines that the penalties provided for in subsection (a) are not warranted by the severity of the program violation, the Secretary may reduce or waive such penalties.

"(d) Penalties collected under this section shall be deposited into the account of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

#### "REGULATIONS"

"SEC. 508. The Secretary may issue such regulations as the Secretary determines necessary to carry out this title."

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DE LA GARZA

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DE LA GARZA: On page 124, line 14, strike the quotation mark and the second period.

On page 124, after line 14, add a new section as follows:

#### "PROGRAM BASES"

"SEC. 509. Notwithstanding section 605, for any crop of wheat or feed grains for which a national marketing certificate program is approved under section 503, no producer of such crop may adjust the producer's crop acreage base for the crop as provided for in section 605, and the producer's base for such crop shall be as determined under title VI without regard to section 605."

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, this amendment to the marketing certificate program as appears in our bill was made necessary by reestimate of the provisions caused by the Congressional Budget Office following adoption of H.R. 2100 by the committee.

This amendment will provide an additional 3 years' saving of over \$2 billion.

This amendment will simply prevent any producer from increasing his wheat or feed grain base during the operation of the market certificate program. There may be a possibility that would entice someone because of the high support to get into the program. This will, in effect, not do any harm to the so-called Stenholm provisions of base and yield.

Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of moving the process along, we have had the opportunity to review this amendment and have no objection to it on this side.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA].

The amendment was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VOLKMER

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOLKMER: Page 110, strike out line 1 and all that follows thereafter through page 124, line 14, and insert the following new title:

#### TITLE VA—PRODUCER-APPROVED WHEAT AND FEED GRAIN PROGRAMS REFERENDA AND QUOTAS, PRODUCTION ACREAGES, MARKETING CERTIFICATES, AND MINIMUM LOAN RATES FOR THE 1986 THROUGH 1991 CROPS OF WHEAT AND FEED GRAINS

SEC. 551. Effective only for the 1986 through 1991 crops, the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1461 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new title V as follows:

#### "TITLE V—REFERENDA AND QUOTAS, PRODUCTION ACREAGES, MARKETING CERTIFICATES, AND MINIMUM LOAN RATES FOR THE 1986 THROUGH 1991 CROPS OF WHEAT AND FEED GRAINS

##### "Subtitle A—Findings and Policy; Consumer Safeguards

##### "FINDINGS AND POLICY

"SEC. 501. (a) Congress finds that—

"(1) wheat and feed grains are essential agricultural commodities for the Nation, are produced throughout the United States by hundreds of thousands of farmers, and along with their products flow in substantial amounts through instrumentalities of interstate and foreign commerce from producers to consumers;

"(2) abnormally excessive and abnormally deficient supplies of wheat and feed grains on the country-wide market acutely and directly affect, burden, and obstruct interstate and foreign commerce; and

"(3) interstate and foreign commerce in wheat and feed grains, and their products, should be protected from burdensome surpluses and disruptive shortages, a supply of the commodities should be maintained to meet domestic consumption needs and export demand, and soil and water resources of the Nation should not be squandered in the production of surplus burdensome supplies of the commodities.

"(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress that it is in the interest of the general welfare to assist in the marketing of wheat and feed grains for domestic consumption and export; to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in the commodities to the extent necessary to provide an orderly, adequate, and balanced flow of the commodities in interstate and foreign commerce; and to provide loans and other means to maintain farm income for producers of the commodities, reduce excess production, and enable consumers to obtain an adequate and steady supply of such commodities at fair prices.

##### "CONSUMER SAFEGUARDS

"SEC. 502. The powers conferred under this title shall not be used to discourage the production of supplies of food and animal feed sufficient to meet normal domestic and export needs, as determined by the Secretary. In carrying out the purposes of this title, the Secretary shall give due regard to the maintenance of a continuous and stable supply of agricultural commodities from do-

mestic production adequate to meet consumer demand at prices fair both to producers and consumers.

#### "Subtitle B—Producer-Approved Wheat and Feed Grain Program

##### "PROCLAMATION OF WHEAT AND FEED GRAIN MARKETING QUOTAS

"SEC. 511. (a) Whenever prior to April 15 in any calendar year the Secretary determines that the total supply of wheat or feed grains, or both, in the marketing years for such commodities beginning in the next succeeding calendar year, in the absence of a marketing year program, will likely be excessive, the Secretary shall proclaim that a national marketing quota for wheat or a national marketing quota for feed grains, as the case may be, or marketing quotas for both, shall be in effect for such marketing years and for the marketing years for the next crop of such commodities. In the case of the marketing years for the 1986 and 1987 crops of such commodities, such determination and proclamation shall be made as soon as practicable after the enactment of the Food Security Act of 1985, but not later than January 1, 1986.

"(b) If a national marketing quota for wheat or feed grains has been proclaimed for any marketing year, the Secretary shall determine and proclaim the amount of the national marketing quota for such marketing year not earlier than January 1 nor later than April 15 of the calendar year preceding the year in which such marketing year begins, except that in the case of the marketing years for the 1986 and 1987 crops, such determination and proclamation shall be made as soon as practicable after the enactment of the Food Security Act of 1985, but not later than January 1, 1986. The amount of the national marketing quota for wheat or feed grains for any marketing year shall be an amount of wheat or feed grains that the Secretary estimates is required to meet anticipated needs during such marketing year, taking into consideration domestic requirements, export demand, food aid needs, and adequate carry-over stocks.

"(c) If, after the proclamation of a national marketing quota for wheat or feed grains for any marketing year, the Secretary determines that the national marketing quota should be terminated or increased to meet a national emergency or a material increase in the demand for wheat or feed grains, the national marketing quota shall be increased or terminated by the Secretary.

##### "FARM MARKETING QUOTAS

"SEC. 512. (a) For each marketing year for wheat or feed grains for which a national marketing quota has been proclaimed under section 511 of this title, the Secretary shall establish farm marketing quotas in accordance with this section.

"(b) The Secretary shall establish a marketing quota apportionment factor for each wheat or feed grain marketing year for which a national marketing quota is proclaimed under section 511. The marketing quota apportionment factor shall be determined by dividing the national marketing quota for such marketing year for wheat or feed grains by the product obtained by multiplying (1) the Secretary's estimate of the average of the then current program yields for wheat or feed grains assigned to each farm by (2) the total of each farm's then current wheat or feed grain crop acreage base.



"(c) The Secretary shall assign a farm marketing quota to each farm with a wheat or feed grain crop acreage base of fifteen acres or more for the crop involved by multiplying the marketing quota apportionment factor determined under subsection (b) of this section by the product obtained by multiplying (1) such farm's then current program yield for wheat or feed grains by (2) such farm's then current wheat or feed grain crop acreage base.

"(d) Farm marketing quotas shall be established by the Secretary under this section by June 1 of the calendar year preceding the marketing year for which a national marketing quota has been proclaimed under this title, except that in the case of the 1986 and 1987 crops, such quotas shall be established as soon as practicable after the enactment of the Food Security Act of 1985, but not later than January 1, 1986.

**"PROCLAMATION OF WHEAT AND FEED GRAINS  
NATIONAL PRODUCTION ACREAGES**

"Sec. 513. (a) If a national marketing quota has been proclaimed for any wheat or feed grain marketing year under section 511 of this title, the Secretary shall proclaim a wheat or feed grain national production acreage for the crop of wheat or feed grains covered by such marketing year on the date that such national marketing quota is proclaimed.

"(b) The amount of the national production acreage for any crop of wheat or feed grains shall be the number of wheat or feed grain acres that the Secretary determines on the basis of the projected national yield and expected underplantings (acreage other than acreage not harvested because of program incentives) of the farm production acreages for such crop will produce an amount of wheat or feed grains equal to the national marketing quota for the commodity for the marketing year for such crop.

"(c) If, after the proclamation of the national production acreage for wheat or feed grains for any crop, the Secretary determines that the national production acreage should be terminated or increased to meet a national emergency or a material increase in the demand for wheat or feed grains, the national production acreage shall be increased or terminated by the Secretary.

**"FARM PRODUCTION ACREAGES**

"Sec. 514. (a) The national production acreage determined under section 513 of this title for a crop of wheat or feed grains shall be apportioned by the Secretary among farms in accordance with this section.

"(b) The Secretary shall establish a production acreage apportionment factor for each crop of wheat or feed grains for which a national production acreage is determined. The production acreage apportionment factor shall be determined by dividing the national production acreage for such crop of wheat or feed grains by the total of the acres of wheat or feed grains included in each farm's wheat or feed grain crop acreage base, as determined under title VI of this Act.

"(c) The Secretary shall determine the wheat or feed grain farm production acreage for each farm (with a crop acreage base for the commodity and crop involved of fifteen acres or more) on which wheat or feed grains are produced by multiplying the production acreage apportionment factor determined under subsection (b) of this section by the farm's wheat or feed grain crop acreage base.

"(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (c) of this section, the farm production acreage for each farm—

"(1) in the case of each crop of wheat, shall be equal to 65 per centum of the farm's crop acreage base for wheat, unless the Secretary estimates that, by the end of the marketing year for that crop of wheat, ending stocks of wheat will be equal to or less than the domestic consumption of wheat for the marketing year; and

"(2) in the case of each crop of feed grains, shall be equal to 80 per centum of the farm's acreage base for feed grains, unless the Secretary estimates that, by the end of the marketing year for that crop of feed grains, ending stocks of feed grains will be 10 per centum or less of the total use of feed grains for the marketing year.

"(e) Subject to the provisions of section 535(b) of this title, whenever a wheat or feed or feed grain production acreage for a crop is established for a farm, other than for a crop which the producers on the farm uses for on-farm feeding purposes and which the producers on the farm certify in writing will be used exclusively for on-farm feeding purposes during the period for which a national production acreage is in effect, under this section, the producers on the farm may not plant an acreage on the farm to the commodity for harvest for the crop in excess of the farm's production acreage for the commodity; and with respect to farms with a crop acreage base for the commodity and crop involved of less than fifteen acres, producers on the farm may not plant an acreage on the farm to the commodity for harvest for the crop in excess of fifteen acres.

**"REFERENDA**

"Sec. 515. (a) If national marketing quotas for wheat, feed grains, or both wheat and feed grains for two marketing years, are proclaimed under section 511 of this title, the Secretary shall, not later than July 1 of the calendar year in which such national marketing quotas are proclaimed, conduct a referendum by secret ballot of wheat and feed grain producers to determine whether they favor or oppose marketing quotas and production acreages for the marketing years and crops for which proclaimed. In the case of the 1986 and 1987 crops, the referendum shall be conducted as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of the Food Security Act of 1985, but not later than February 1, 1986.

"(b) Any producer with a wheat or feed grain crop acreage base of fifteen or more acres for the than current crop, as determined under title VI of this Act, shall be eligible to vote in the referendum. For purposes of this section, the term 'producer' shall include any person who is entitled to share in a crop of the commodity, or the proceeds thereof, because the person shares in the risks of production of the crop as an owner, landlord, tenant, or sharecropper. A landlord whose return from the crop is fixed regardless of the amount of the crop produced shall not be considered a producer.

"(c) The Secretary shall proclaim the results of any referendum held hereunder within fifteen days after the date of such referendum and if the Secretary determines that 60 per centum or more of the producers of wheat and feed grains (including 50 per centum or more of the producers of wheat and 50 per centum or more of the producers of feed grains) voting in the referendum voted for marketing quotas and production acreages, the Secretary shall proclaim that marketing quotas and production

acreages will be in effect with respect to the crops of wheat or feed grains, or both, produced for harvest in the two calendar years following the year in which the referendum is held (or in the case of the referendum held no later than February 1, 1986, for crops harvested in 1986 and 1987).

"(d) In the event that marketing quotas and production acreages are approved with respect to the 1986 crop of wheat or feed grains, the Secretary shall provide fair and equitable compensation to producers who planted a crop in excess of their farm production acreage prior to the proclamation by the Secretary that marketing quotas and production acreages will be in effect with respect to that crop. Such compensation shall cover at a minimum the costs incurred by producers for planting such crop, as determined by the Secretary.

"(e) If the Secretary determines that 60 per centum or more of the producers of wheat and feed grains (including 50 per centum or more of the producers of wheat and 50 per centum or more of the producers of feed grains) voting in a referendum approved marketing quotas and production acreages for a period of two marketing years, no referendum shall be held for the next year of such period.

"(f) If marketing quotas and production acreages are not approved by producers in a referendum as provided under this section, with respect to the crops harvested in the succeeding year, in lieu of such marketing quotas and production acreages, the Secretary shall provide such loans, purchases, payments, and other assistance to producers of wheat and feed grains as provided elsewhere in this Act.

**"LOANS AND PURCHASES**

"Sec. 516. (a) If producers of wheat and feed grains approve marketing quotas and production acreages, as provided in section 515 of this title, loans and purchases shall be made available to producers as provided in sections 105C and 107D of this Act, except that the minimum loan rates for the crops of wheat or feed grains with respect to which marketing quotas and production acreages are in effect—

"(1) in the case of wheat, shall be not less than \$5.03 per bushel for the 1986 crop, and, for each of the 1987 through 1991 crops of wheat, shall be not less than a level that represents an increase of two parity index points over the previous crop's minimum loan level, or the level provided in the following table, whichever is less:

"for the 1987 crop.....	\$5.17 per bushel
for the 1988 crop.....	5.31 per bushel
for the 1989 crop.....	5.45 per bushel
for the 1990 crop.....	5.59 per bushel
for the 1991 crop.....	5.73 per bushel.

"(2) in the case of corn, shall be not less than \$3.49 per bushel of corn for the 1986 crop, and, for the 1987 through 1991 crops, shall be not less than a level that represents an increase of two parity index points over the previous crop's minimum loan level, or the level provided in the following table, whichever is less:

"for the 1987 crop.....	\$3.59 per bushel
for the 1988 crop.....	3.69 per bushel
for the 1989 crop.....	3.79 per bushel
for the 1990 crop.....	3.89 per bushel
for the 1991 crop.....	3.99 per bushel.

"(3) in the case of feed grains other than corn, for each of the 1986 through 1991 crops, shall be such rate as the Secretary determines fair and reasonable in relation to the rate at which loans are made available for corn.

"(b) Loans referred to in subsection (a) shall not be subject to the limitation on nonrecourse loans set forth in section 405(b) of this Act.

#### MARKETING CERTIFICATES

"Sec. 531. (a) At the time a producer of wheat or feed grains is assigned a farm marketing quota under section 512 of this title for any marketing year, the Secretary shall issue a marketing certificate to such producer for the crop of such commodity covered by such marketing year. The Secretary shall also issue marketing certificates to producers with a wheat or feed grain crop acreage base of less than 15 acres (producers not assigned a farm marketing quota) for such commodities to be produced on such crop acreage base for the crop covered by such marketing year.

"(b) A marketing certificate applicable to marketing year issued to a producer of wheat or feed grains shall authorize such producer to market, barter, or donate, during such marketing year, an amount of such commodity equal to the farm marketing quota assigned to such producer (or, in the case of a producer not assigned a marketing quota because the producer's crop acreage base for the commodity crop is less than 15 acres, an amount of such commodity equal to the producer's production of the commodity on the acreage—if the acreage is less than fifteen acres—planted to the commodity for harvest.

"(c) The Secretary shall adjust the amount of wheat or feed grains that may be marketed, bartered, or donated under a marketing certificate to reflect the amount of such commodity that will be used for feed, human consumption, or other purposes on the farm of the producer.

"(d) If for any crop, the wheat or feed grains that the producer harvests exceeds the amount of the commodity that may be marketed, bartered, or donated under a marketing certificate, the surplus amount of such commodity may be used for feed, human consumption, or other purposes on the farm of the producer, or may be carried over by the producer from one marketing year to the succeeding marketing year and may be marketed without penalty imposed under section 532 of this subtitle in the succeeding marketing year to the extent that (1) the total amount of such commodity available for marketing from the farm in the marketing year from which such commodity is carried over does not exceed the farm marketing quota, and (2) the total amount of such commodity available for marketing in the succeeding marketing year (that is, the sum of the amount of such commodity carried over and the amount of such commodity produced on the farm subject to a farm marketing quota in the succeeding marketing year) does not exceed the farm marketing quota for the succeeding marketing year.

"(e) Wheat for feed grains harvested in a calendar year in which marketing quotas are in effect for the marketing year beginning therein shall be subject to such quotas even though such commodity is marketed prior to the date on which such marketing year begins.

"(f) A person may not purchase or otherwise acquire an amount of a commodity from a producer in excess of the amount of the commodity that may be marketed, bartered, or donated by such producer under a marketing certificate.

"(g) If marketing quotas for a commodity are not in effect for any marketing year, all previous marketing certificates applicable to

such commodity shall be terminated, effective as of the first day of such marketing year.

#### "PENALTIES

"Sec. 532. (a)(1) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, if a producer fails to comply with any term or condition of a program conducted under this title, the producer shall be ineligible for any loan, purchase, or payment authorized under this Act.

"(2) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, if a producer markets, barter, or donates a commodity without a marketing certificate required under section 532 of this subtitle or markets, barter, or donates an amount of a commodity for use in excess of the amount of the commodity the producer is permitted to market, barter, or donate under such certificate, the Secretary shall—

"(A) assess a civil penalty against such producer in an amount equal to three times the current minimum loan rate for the commodity so marketed, bartered, or donated; or

"(B) decrease the number of acres of the producer's wheat or feed grain crop acreage base such producer may devote to production under section 514 of this title for the succeeding crop of the commodity by a number of acres that, if planted, would result in the production of a quantity sufficient to satisfy the penalty referred to in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph.

"(3) If a person knowingly purchases or otherwise acquires an amount of a commodity from a producer in excess of the amount of the commodity that may be marketed, bartered, or donated by such producer under a marketing certificate issued under section 531 of this subtitle, the Secretary shall assess a civil penalty against such person in an amount equal to three times the current minimum loan rate for the commodities so purchased or acquired.

"(b) If a producer fails to comply fully with the terms and conditions of a program conducted under this title and the Secretary believes the failure should not preclude the making of loans, purchases, or payments to the producer, the Secretary may make loans, purchases, or payments in such amounts as the Secretary determines to be equitable in relation to the severity of the program violation.

"(c) If the Secretary determines that the penalties provided for in subsection (a) of this section are not warranted by the severity of the program violation, the Secretary may reduce or waive such penalties.

"(d) Penalties collected under this section shall be deposited into the account of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

#### "TRANSFER OF FARM MARKETING QUOTAS

"Sec. 534. Farm marketing quotas assigned to a farm under this title generally shall not be transferable, but, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary for such purpose, the farm marketing quota assigned to a farm for any marketing year, or any portion thereof, may be voluntarily surrendered to the Secretary by the producer, and the Secretary may reallocate the amount of any farm marketing quotas so surrendered to other farms having farm marketing quotas on such basis as the Secretary may determine.

#### "CONSERVATION OF ACREAGE REMOVED FROM PRODUCTION

"Sec. 535. (a) A producer of a commodity shall devote to approved conservation use all acreage of the farm's wheat or feed grain

crop acreage base that may not be devoted to the production of the commodity involved under the rules applicable to farm production acreages under sections 514 and 524 of this title.

"(b) The Secretary may make such adjustments in the amount of such acreage removed from production as the Secretary determines necessary to correct for abnormal factors affecting production and to give due consideration to tillable acreage, crop-rotation practices, types of soil, soil and water conservation measures, topography, and such other factors as the Secretary determines appropriate.

"(c) Regulations issued by the Secretary under this section with respect to acreage required to be devoted to conservation uses shall require appropriate measures to protect such acreage against noxious weeds and wind and water erosion.

"(d)(1) Any acreage removed from production may be devoted to wildlife food plots or wildlife habitats in conformity with standards established by the Secretary in consultation with wildlife agencies.

"(2) The Secretary may pay such amount as the Secretary considers appropriate of the cost of the practices designed to carry out the purposes of paragraph (1) of this subsection.

"(3) The Secretary may provide for an additional payment on such acreage in an amount determined by the Secretary to be appropriate in relations to the benefit to the general public if the producer agrees to permit, without other compensation, access to all or such portion of the farm, as the Secretary may prescribe, by the general public for hunting, trapping, fishing, and hiking, subject to applicable State and Federal regulations.

"(e)(1) A producer of a commodity shall execute an agreement with the Secretary that describes the means the producer will use to comply with this section not later than such date as the Secretary may prescribe.

"(2) The Secretary may, by mutual agreement with such producer, terminate or modify any such agreement if the Secretary determines such action necessary because of an emergency created by drought or other disaster or to prevent or alleviate a shortage in the supply of agricultural commodities.

#### "REGULATIONS

"Sec. 536. The Secretary may issue such regulations as the Secretary determines necessary to carry out this title.

#### "COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

"Sec. 537. The Secretary shall carry out the program authorized by this title through the Commodity Credit Corporation.

#### "ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

"Sec. 538. The provisions of sections 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 372(d), 373, 374, 375, and 376 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended by section 452 of the Food Security Act of 1985, shall apply to the programs in effect under this title for any of the 1986 through 1991 crops of wheat and feed grains."

#### "LIMITATION ON IMPORTS

"Sec. 539. If imports of grain or processed grain threaten to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, the national marketing quota program, Congress expects the Secretary will take appropriate action available under section 22 of the Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1933 as is necessary in order



that such imports will not render ineffective or materially interfere with this program."

Amend the table of contents in section 2 accordingly.

Mr. VOLKMER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

PERFECTING AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VOLKMER TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VOLKMER

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I also have a perfecting amendment at the desk.

Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLKMER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADIGAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

If the amendment is the same as the one just offered by the Chairman, we would have no objection to it on this side and would ask unanimous consent that it be considered as read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] needs unanimous consent to offer an amendment to his own amendment.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent, then, to offer the perfecting amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The text of the perfecting amendment offered by Mr. VOLKMER, to the amendment offered by Mr. VOLKMER is as follows:

Perfecting amendment offered by Mr. VOLKMER to the amendment offered by Mr. VOLKMER: After section 532, insert a new section as follows:

#### "PROGRAM BASES

"SEC. 533. Notwithstanding section 605, for any crop of wheat or feed grains for which a national marketing certificate program is approved under section 515, no producer of such crop may adjust the producer's crop acreage base for the crop as provided for in section 605, and the producer's base for such crop shall be as determined under title VI without regard to section 605."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. VOLKMER) is recog-

nized for 5 minutes on his amendment to his amendment.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. EVANS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EVANS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, are we moving on the gentleman's perfecting amendment at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. EVANS of Illinois. His other amendment is still open and subject to debate?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. EVANS of Illinois. I thank the Chair.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Committee, we are now on the mandatory program amendment. I would like to first reflect a little bit, as has been discussed earlier during the debate on the Stangeland-Roberts-Glickman, et cetera, amendment, the condition of agriculture throughout the Midwest especially, and especially in northern Missouri. If you go from the northern Missouri River, from St. Joseph to Hannibal, my home town, you will find many farmers out there who are in very serious difficulty. And I am sure that people from Iowa and Illinois and Nebraska and other parts of this country can say the same thing.

Three out of the last 5 years, though, in our area have been disasters. 1981 was a wet year, 1983 and 1984 were drought years. We had such things as 12-bushel-an-acre soybeans and 10-bushel-an-acre corn. Some fields were without any ears at all on their corn. As a result of that, many farmers who had borrowed in order to put their crops in did not have any money to pay it back, and they had to go back and borrow again for another year. So as a result of all of these circumstances, plus buying the machinery in the late 1970's, they find themselves with a debt-asset ratio of anywhere from 50 percent to 75 percent, many of them. They are not able at today's prices to be able to pay those debts, principal, and also have a living off of that farm. So it has been a devastation. In fact, the University of Missouri, the Agriculture School and Economics Department, in a meeting that I had with them a couple weeks ago, estimated that if we continue on down the line with the programs that we presently have—and that is basically what is in the permanent provisions in this bill—that one-third to one-half of the farmers of northern Missouri are gone at the end of 4 years.

It has been alluded to earlier that that is not just farmers who are going to be gone. That is also small businesses, implement dealers. And I know many of you could tell the same story, that 4 years ago there were small

towns that had three or four implement dealers and today they have one, where before they maybe had two hardware stores, they have got one. Many of my small towns have windows in stores that are boarded up. Nobody is willing to go back in them. Agriculture has been the main economy for that area, and agriculture is the No. 1 industry for the State of Missouri. Agriculture is sick and hurting.

Now, there are only two alternatives for my farmers, as far as getting out of this. One is if interest rates would go down about 3 or 4 percent, they could finance their indebtedness on that basis; but that is not going to happen, and we all know that is not going to happen. And the other alternative is for their income to go up.

Well, under the provisions that are in the bill presently, outside of the Bedell amendment, but the permanent provisions, their income is not going to go up. In fact, their net income will decline each year for the next 4 years because the cost of production will go up while the income maintenance stays the same.

So they are looking for a devastation. We are looking for a loss of schools. The land values will continue to deteriorate. We have had a deterioration of anywhere from 30 to 40 percent already of land values in the last 3½ years. That will continue. That erodes the base of my counties, of my schools, my cities, to where they do not have any base any longer, and it has a detrimental effect on the total social and economic structure of rural Missouri, and I say rural United States also.

Now, projections are if we go along with the permanent parts of this bill we are going to continue to have large carryover stocks. Let us just take this year. Wheat, 1.6 billion bushel carryover. That is not going to help prices get up. Corn nearly 3 billion, almost where we were in 1982. With soybeans, we are going to have a record carryover, more than we have ever had.

You can look at the prices. In 1983 in my area our local price for corn was \$3.45.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. VOLKMER was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. VOLKMER. In 1983, the corn price was \$3.45; in 1984, \$2.89; and today they run, depending on whether you are on the Mississippi barge or whether you are inland, \$2.00 to \$2.20 a bushel.

Wheat in 1983 was \$3.41 on the average; in 1984 it was \$3.36. We are now down to \$2.40 to \$2.71.

Soybeans in 1983 was \$8.56. In 1984 it dropped down to \$5.94. And now it is

down to less than \$5, around \$4.92 to \$5, depending, again, on the market.

These are declining prices, and we are going to continue to see declining prices unless we do something about the type of legislation that we offer to the farmers.

We are going to continue to have what we have had this year over last year, declining exports.

Now, the administration has taken a position that we need to get down to market clearing prices. Well, you are not going to clear the markets, you are going to clear out the farmers if you go to that.

They say we have to get to market clearing prices in order to continue to increase our exports. Yet I would like to point out to you that this year over last year we have lower farm prices, yet our exports are not increasing, our exports are actually still declining.

So the administration's answer to the solution as we have seen from the last record vote on the Frank amendment has been rejected by the House and the Senate and about everybody. We cannot have lower cash prices without some kind of government support.

The budget does not permit us, however, to support the farmers to the extent that they should be supported. So there is only one other way, and that is to reduce production through what I call a mandatory program. Under the provision that I am offering to the House as we have it today, it goes to the vote of the farmers. Given the farmers a choice, whether they wish to reduce production, increase their income, or they wish to continue, basically, all-out production and have lower prices for their commodities. In other words, I say that the farmer should be entitled to make that choice. Let the farmer decide whether or not he wishes to have such a program.

We already have a provision in the bill that, basically, provides for a referendum, known as the Bedell amendment, which I support. However, I just feel it does not go far enough. Under the Bedell amendment, wheat price would be at \$4.50. Under the mandatory program, with marketing certificates on a bushel basis, we can have the wheat next year at \$5.03.

In the Bedell amendment, corn is at \$3.25. Under a mandatory price program, we could have corn at \$3.49.

By using a marketing certificate and without farmers being able to move their bases and basing the marketing certificate on bushels, we can hold our production in line and, as a result, we can have a program whereby our farmers can make it through at least a couple of years, we can stabilize land values, we can help our small business people in our local towns, we can increase or at least stabilize the tax base for these communities, and at less cost

to the taxpayers than any other program that we have, at less cost than what is in the bill.

Now, I will admit that with the increased prices to the farmers, the price of a loaf of bread in the grocery store, a pound loaf of bread, will probably have to go up three-fourths of a cent or one cent to take care of that increased price to the farmer. A box of cereal will probably have to go up 2 or 3 cents to provide for income for the farmer. A pound of hamburger may have to go up 2 or 3 cents.

But, Mr. Chairman, I think we need to realize that the people in this country today live better for less than any place else in the world. We eat better for less than any place else in the world. Right now the amount that the American family spends of disposable income on food ranks about 13 percent of their disposable income.

□ 1635

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. VOLKMER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Basically, that is less than any other industrialized country or any other country in this world in which statistics are kept. In no other place can you eat so well for so little. It has been the American farmer that has been basically subsidizing the consumer because he has been getting lower prices. The consumer has not necessarily been benefiting from those lower prices that the farmers got.

All we are asking is that the farmer be able to get a little bit more for the productivity that he has given to the American consumer throughout these years. Under this program, which I want to reiterate, it would only be enacted if voted upon favorably by 60 percent of the farmers. I feel that we can get the American farmer back on his feet again, and that we can stabilize farm income and our farmland values to where we can be proud to say that we finally have done something in this Congress for the American farmer rather than doing something to him.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair please state to the Committee the prevailing amendment together with the parliamentary situation. I was not able to hear.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] has an amendment pending to his own amendment. Once we dispose of that, then the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ROBERT F.

SMITH] will be recognized to further amend the Volkmer amendment.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the perfecting amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

The perfecting amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROBERT F. SMITH TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VOLKMER, AS AMENDED

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH to the amendment offered by Mr. VOLKMER, as amended: the Volkmer amendment is amended by striking all after title VA and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

PRODUCER-APPROVED WHEAT, FEED GRAIN, COTTON, RICE, AND SOYBEAN PROGRAMS

REFERENDA FOR THE 1987 THROUGH 1990 CROPS OF WHEAT, FEED GRAINS, COTTON, RICE, AND SOYBEANS

SEC. 551. Effective only for the 1986 through 1990 crops, the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1461 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new title V as follows:

"TITLE V—REFERENDA FOR THE 1987 THROUGH 1990 CROPS OF WHEAT, FEED GRAINS, COTTON, RICE, AND SOYBEANS

"WHEAT, FEED GRAIN, COTTON, RICE, AND SOYBEAN REFERENDA

"SEC. 501. (a) The Secretary shall conduct a referendum by secret ballot of wheat, feed grain, cotton, rice, and soybean producers February 1, 1986 to determine whether they favor or oppose the agricultural programs set forth in sections 107D, 105C, 103(i), 101(j), and 201(g) of this Act. This vote shall be applicable to the 1987, 1988, 1989, and 1990 crops of wheat, feed grains, upland cotton, rice, and soybeans.

"(b) Any producer on a farm with a wheat, feed grain, cotton, rice, or soybeans crop acreage base of fifteen or more acres for the then current crop, as determined under title VI, shall be eligible to vote in a referendum. For the purposes of this section, the term "producers" shall include any person who is entitled to share in a crop of the commodity, or the proceeds thereof, because the person shares in the risks of production of the crop as an owner, landlord, tenant, or sharecropper. A landlord whose return from the crop is fixed regardless of the amount of the crop produced shall not be considered a producer.

"(c) The Secretary shall proclaim the results of the referendum held hereunder within fifteen days after the date of such referendum. If the Secretary determines that 60 per centum or more of the producers of wheat, feed grain, cotton, rice, and soybeans (including 50 per centum or more of the producers of each of the following crops: wheat, feed grain, cotton, rice, and soybeans) vote against continuing the agricultural programs set forth in sections 107D, 105C, 103(i), 101(j) and 201(g) of this



Act, then such sections shall have no effect for the 1987 through 1990 crops of such commodities.

"(d) If voters in the referendum vote against continuing the agricultural programs set forth in section 2 107D, 105C, 103(i), 101(j) and 201(g) of this Act as set forth in subsection (c), the Secretary shall provide such loans, purchases, payments, and other assistance to producers of wheat, feed grain, cotton, rice, and soybeans as provided for elsewhere in this Act.

#### "REGULATIONS

"Sec. 502. The Secretary may issue such regulations as the Secretary determines necessary to carry out this title."

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, my point of order is that the amendment goes to other titles including the referendum pertaining to not only wheat and feed grains but also cotton, rice, and soybean programs where the title VA does not pertain to those programs or referendum on those programs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH] for his response to the point of order.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is considered in the referenda portion of the bill. The referenda portion refers several titles to the people of this country, and my referendum does follow the rest of the referenda.

If this one is to be out of order, I assume we cannot discuss any referendum under this title VA.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, continuing under my point of order, in perhaps assistance to the gentleman from Oregon, it would appear to me that such an amendment would be in order at the end of the bill or at the end of all titles, pertaining to all the titles. But this title VA, basically only pertains to wheat and feed grains.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike everything in my amendment except wheat and feed grains.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will first dispose of the point of order, unless the point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH] please restate his unanimous-consent request?

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Chairman, do I understand that the gentleman is going to change his amendment so it only applies to wheat?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH] has withdrawn his request.

Mr. BEDELL. I thank the Chair.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. I thank the Chair, and I thank my colleagues for their concern about this issue.

Mr. Chairman, there will be placed before us today several methods of allowing farmers in America to vote on various kinds of programs, and it seemed to me that at least one alternative should be the best interests of the Committee on Agriculture, recognizing that for the past 9 months and certainly for the past 4 months, the Committee on Agriculture has been working, in most cases, without dissension trying to find the best avenue to draft a farm bill under very difficult circumstances in this country. Certainly with limited, which the Members have heard, and with tragic circumstances in America regarding agriculture. The best efforts of the best minds of Democrats and Republicans, seriously and sincerely.

In practically every case, without partisanship, they have drafted a bill and are bringing it before you today. You have seen some efforts to amend it, and you will see some efforts to refer questions about agriculture which, by the way, I must say have been untested. The committee has not heard the impact or the implications of them, but yet, we do have a bill which is before us, which is still open to amendment, but in most cases already this Congress has followed the lead of the very able chairman and the ranking member and those people who have been working on this bill diligently.

As regard for that, it seemed to me that if we are going to really be in favor of allowing the farmer to make a choice in whether or not a farm bill ought to be defeated or not in the country, we ought to give the farmer the best efforts of our achievement. There is no question that the best efforts, the time-tested efforts, come from the committee. They come from a majority of the committee, and as I say, come without prejudice.

So, if indeed it is true that we ought to let the farmer make a decision, let us give him the best we have, or her. Let us give him the result of the hearings tested farm program, of the input from people all over this Nation, North, East, South, and West, that we

have in the basic bill before us. Let us not mislead the farmer with an untested program in one direction or another.

So my amendment, very basically, is simply an effort to bring the best efforts of the Agriculture Committee to the people in this country. I ask you to support it if you believe in a referendum, and I do. If you believe that farmers ought to determine what should happen, and I do. My dates follow exactly the Bedell amendment dates; they follow exactly those people who are qualified to vote under Bedell, they are qualified to vote here in my amendment. I have carefully followed that simply because those folks have done a great deal of work in trying to find the best referendum that they could manufacture. I think they have.

Basically, my amendment follows the Bedell referendum; those qualified to vote. It provides, however, differently that we give the best efforts of the bill that passes the House of Representatives to the farmers and allows them to make a decision about their future.

□ 1645

It seems to me that this is the best reasonable approach for those who want a referendum and for those who feel that maybe we are not doing the right thing. We can come back and write a new bill, but let us find out how the farmers feel about the best effort of the Agriculture Committee, Democrats and Republicans representing North, West, East, and South.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to go through some specifics of the gentleman's amendment to see if I fully understand his amendment.

In the first place, it applies, as he has stated, to wheat, feed grains, cotton, rice, and soybeans, all those commodities, to begin with. Second, it pertains to a referendum on the programs that are existing in the present bill; is that correct? In other words, you would be asking the farmers to vote on the wheat program as we have it in the bill, or on the corn or feed grain program and the cotton, soybean, and rice programs, as to whether or not they favor it?

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, if I may answer the gentleman, I am asking those people to vote on what may result in being the final farm bill as it is produced by this House of Representatives.

Mr. VOLKMER. That is correct. You are going to ask them to vote on all these things, and then the alternative, in the event the farmers would

vote against it, would be to go back to the 1949 act and let the Secretary implement the provisions of the 1949 act or the 1949 law?

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. That is not correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH] has expired.

(On request of Mr. VOLKMER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for obtaining extra time for me.

That is not correct.

Mr. VOLKMER. Then what would we have.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Let me answer the gentleman, please.

Mr. VOLKMER. All right.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. The bill that passes the House of Representatives becomes the law. The question will be referred, as with the Bedell issue, in February of 1986, and it will be the law for 1986. If at that point it is voted down, then the Congress has 1986 until the next crop year to produce another farm bill. That is my amendment.

Mr. VOLKMER. I do not find that. It says in here: "If voters in the referendum vote against continuing the agricultural programs \* \* \* as set forth \* \* \* the Secretary shall provide such loans, purchases, payments, and other assistance to producers of wheat, feed grain, cotton, rice, and soybeans as provided for elsewhere in this act."

Now, as to the referendum, then, are you saying it is only for that year? I see it is 1987, only 1987. So the present law would apply to 1986 only?

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. That is correct, unless it were passed, as does the Bedell amendment, as the gentleman well knows. If it were approved by the farmers, then it would become the law, just as the Bedell amendment does. I followed the Bedell language very carefully. I merely referred to the question of the farm bill that passes the House, which is the best efforts of the House of Representatives.

It is not a new idea, not something that has come off the shelf without hearings. It is a bill that we have worked over, that we have had hearings on and have had the best input from the Members of the House of Representatives, as well as all commodity groups across the Nation. That is what we are referring to, the best effort of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally in order that the House may receive a message from the President.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. SHARP) assumed the chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will receive a message.

#### SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Saunders, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

#### FOOD SECURITY ACT OF 1985

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADIGAN].

Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great deal of discussion about the desirability of giving the agriculture producers in the country the opportunity at referendum next year, the opportunity to vote on some sort of agriculture or farm bill proposal. We presume that the two Houses of this Congress and the President will be able at some point during the balance of this year to agree on some type of farm bill for the next 4 years.

If it is so desirable to allow farmers to vote on something at referendum, what is wrong with letting the farmers vote on the farm bill approved by this Congress and the President this year? If the object is just to have a referendum, since everyone is running around here saying, "Oh, let's let the farmers have a referendum," if that is the object, then why not have a referendum on the farm bill? And if a majority of the farmers agree with what the Congress and the President has done, then that is the farm bill for the next 4 years.

But if they disagree, then it would be the farm bill for only 1 year, and in 1987 the Congress and the President would have to take up the task of writing a new farm bill.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADIGAN. Yes; I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman asks, why should we not vote on the actions of the committee, on the work product of the committee, to determine the attitudes of the farmers, and if the farmers do not like the bill, then we will write another bill?

Well, the answer to why we cannot delay was dramatically demonstrated by the Governor of Iowa, Governor Branstad, today. This is a Republican Governor who declared a state of economic emergency in Iowa, and his

action was based upon an emergency which he declared due to the economic depression in the farm community, the lack of progress toward congressional passage of a farm bill, and the insolvency of the farm credit system and the adverse actions against its borrowers for failure of Congress to act on the farm bill.

That is the answer to the gentleman's question.

Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. ALEXANDER. And I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MADIGAN. But I am not suggesting that we delay. I am suggesting that we move ahead, that we pass the farm bill, and that somehow we implore the President to sign that farm bill and then we let the farmers next February vote at referendum as to whether or not they like it. And if they like it, it is the law for 4 years. If they do not like it, it is the law only for 1986, and for 1987 we would do it over.

I am not suggesting any kind of delay, whatsoever. I am familiar with the circumstances that occurred in Iowa today to which the gentleman refers, and in response to the gentleman I could make the point that the proposal offered by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, will have, if it were to be approved at referendum by the farmers, the very potential to exacerbate that problem in Iowa because what that referendum would say is that so much of everybody's land is going to be retired. That is what it would say.

So some of the best farmland in America located in Iowa would mandatorily be required to be retired, and land that was put in production in the 1970's, pastureland that should never be in production, land that we would like to get out of production because it is very fragile and very erodible land, 70 to 80 percent of that land, whatever the percentage is, would be in production as a result of this referendum. So what you are doing is artificially deflating the value of that good farmland in Iowa, exacerbating the problem that the Governor confronts today, and artificially inflating land in other parts of the country that should never have been put into production to begin with. You are artificially transferring land values from one place to another by imposing upon the relationship between agriculture and the Government of the United States this mandatory condition that so much of everybody's land must be retired.

That simply has not been thought out by our good friend, the gentleman from Missouri. It has not been thought out by our very good friend, the gentleman from Iowa, who spon-



sored a somewhat similar proposal. Those things need to be considered, and if you consider the whole of those things, as I am sure the farmers surely will, the next year they are not going to vote for those things.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADIGAN] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MADIGAN was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. MADIGAN. So, Mr. Chairman, to simplify this process and to respond to this call that we give them some referendum to vote on, let us allow them to vote on a referendum on what we do here. I do not see anything wrong with that. I think it is not confusing to them at all. It is not time-delaying or dilatory in any way. It is to the point, it gives them something to vote on, and it gets us on with our business.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Smith substitute and in support of the Volkmer amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would first like to thank my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADIGAN], for yielding to me to respond to his question that he posed to the committee a moment ago. But I see it somewhat differently.

I will admit with the gentleman that the situation can become confusing very fast, and that Members of Congress who are not familiar with farm bills can be confused by a debate which replaces reason with rhetoric. And I do not mean by that that the gentleman is insincere. I think that the gentleman is sincere in attempting to continue the current policy, and that is in effect what the gentleman's amendment would do. He would continue the current policy.

The Governor of Iowa declared a state of emergency today because the current farm policy has placed farmers in a state of chaos and a state of bankruptcy. The import of the Governor's declaration of emergency has the impact of allowing farmers who are threatened with foreclosure to go into the State courts and to seek a moratorium based upon Iowa law to prevent that foreclosure from taking their farms and taking their homes in satisfaction of the delinquent debts which they owe.

Iowa is not different from Arkansas or the district that I represent, nor is it different from any farm State in the Nation. Just today a group of Arkansas farmers came to my office, one of whom is a lifelong friend whom I have known for my entire life. His father farmed, he has farmed, and he has children. He said to me that "The current farm law has so darkened the future of farming that I regret that my children cannot carry on the

family tradition that was handed down to me by my father, and I have recommended to them that they seek their futures elsewhere."

That is a tragedy that is repeated across this land in thousands and thousands of cases because the current farm policy is bankrupt. It has not worked.

Any why has it not worked? It has not worked because the present farm policy is based upon the presumption of export. Roughly 50 to 60 percent of our products that we produce on the farm are intended for foreign markets. We hear throughout the news today that we cannot sell our products overseas because of an overvalued dollar, which makes our products too expensive to foreigners. That is true of corn, it is true of wheat, and it is true of soybeans. It is true of Caterpillar building equipment. It is true of anything we produce for export.

As a result of this overvalued dollar, our warehouses are bulging at the seams, and it is costing the American taxpayer a million dollars a day to store those products, that surplus.

Now, what are the farmers asking through this amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri? They are asking to replace the current bankrupt policy with a rule of reason. They know that they cannot sell their products because of current economic conditions and current economic policy, so they want the right to vote to reduce their production and, therefore, allow the law of supply and demand to raise the prices when the current surplus is sold and eliminated.

□ 1700

That is all the farmers are asking is the right to reduce their production, which reduces the cost to the Government, it reduces the deficit, it makes better the economic conditions in our country. It even has the potential of lowering interest rates because our farmers want to lower the deficit.

The gentleman's amendment would in effect continue this policy, continue this bankruptcy, continue the tragedy which I made reference to earlier in calling upon the story told to me by my friend, the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. FRANKLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Mississippi.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ALEXANDER was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. FRANKLIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from across the river for yielding on this point.

I would like to ask my colleague from Arkansas, who represents basically the same kind of farm country that I do, we are right across the river and represent the great Mississippi Delta, if the gentleman is aware of the testimony that came before the Agriculture Committee concerning the referendum of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER], that if it were passed there would have to be mandatory set-asides of upwards of 50 percent in most of the crop commodities included if the referendum passes and the mandatory type controls go into effect.

I want to know if the gentleman is aware of that and if his Arkansas farmers are aware of that.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I will reclaim my time. I am aware of the gentleman's source of information, the U.S. Department of Agriculture. That is in error, the same as their current policy is wrong.

The Volkmer amendment would allow up to 35 percent cutback if the farmers themselves voted that amendment in effect and it would allow a 20-percent set-aside for the small farmer who earns less than \$200,000 annual gross income.

I do not give credibility to the Department of Agriculture's representations on this subject. I am sorry. If the gentleman would like to cite additional data, I would be pleased to recognize him; but the Department of Agriculture has no credibility on this particular subject, because the information that it has put out is just as wrong as the policy that it is imposing upon the American farmer.

The gentleman from Missouri is trying to change that policy and that is why I support his amendment and I oppose the amendment to it that is offered.

I would say in addition on this subject, Mr. Chairman, that to urban Members of Congress who are not familiar with all of the intricacies of a farm bill, that the proposal offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] would cost less to the American taxpayer. It would reduce the deficit. It would raise income to the American farmer and it would help every American citizen.

Now, some people come back and say, "Well, you're going to raise consumer prices."

The amount of wheat in a loaf of bread is just a small percentage of the cost. It might raise the cost of a loaf of bread 4 cents or 3 cents or 5 cents, but not very much.

We are asking for the law of supply and demand and the rule of reason to be applied to the plight of the American farmer. That is all we are asking in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. Chairman, I vigorously support the gentleman's amendment and I urge my colleagues, especially those from the urban areas of this country, to give consideration to this proposal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman for Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER] has again expired.

(At the request of Mr. FRANKLIN, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ALEXANDER was allowed to proceed for an additional 3 minutes.)

Mr. FRANKLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. FRANKLIN. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman knows, the referendum proposed by the gentleman from Missouri that is before us now only covers wheat and feed grains.

Mr. ALEXANDER. That is correct.

Mr. FRANKLIN. The gentleman and I have a common interest in other crops and commodities that are grown so abundantly in our districts. They are cotton, rice, and soybeans.

Does the gentleman from Arkansas advocate that we apply the same kind of a referendum to those major crop commodities that the gentleman and I are so desperately interested in in our part of the country?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Indeed, I do; but the subject before us is wheat and feed grains.

Mr. FRANKLIN. Well, will the gentleman continue to yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRANKLIN. I would like to say that the consensus of the people I talked to who represent comparable farms to those the gentleman represents do not feel that they can possibly make it by having to set aside up to 50 percent of the acreage that they are now producing.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The gentleman continues to use Department of Agriculture data which I have refuted.

Mr. FRANKLIN. Well, please, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRANKLIN. Where in this world should we go for competent data other than to the Government or agency who is responsible for keeping the statistics and knowing the things and who has the capability of coming and telling us what from the ASCS office is dependable?

Mr. ALEXANDER. May I answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. FRANKLIN. Go right ahead.

Mr. ALEXANDER. That is one of the reasons that our farm situation is in such a dismal mess, because we have had to rely upon the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. FRANKLIN. Well, then, the gentleman will not concede that there will have to be substantial reductions

of a mandatory nature if a referendum of this nature is passed.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I am sorry. I was talking to someone. Would the gentleman repeat that?

Mr. FRANKLIN. The gentleman would certainly concede that if this referendum was passed, there would have to be substantial amounts of reductions in acreage planted.

Mr. ALEXANDER. That is the idea.

Mr. FRANKLIN. As opposed to what currently we do in setting aside crops in the acreage allotments.

Mr. ALEXANDER. That is the idea, to reduce production so that the supply will be lower and the price will rise.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman saying that the data supplied by the local ASCS offices is inaccurate?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I am saying that the information that the gentleman from Mississippi has offered in arguing his position against the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. VOLKMER) is inaccurate.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman from Arkansas said that he has refuted the data of the Department of Agriculture. I understood that the gentleman disagreed with the data of the Department of Agriculture, but I did not hear the gentleman refute it.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Well, I can refute it to give the gentleman's supporting data to refute it. I have it here from the various sources, including committees that we depend upon like the Budget Committee and so on, that refutes that data; but there again, we are arguing the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri, not the plight of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Volkmer amendment and against the Smith amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is my first time to stand and speak concerning this agriculture legislation; however, I think most of the Members know my roots go deep in agriculture. Like some of you, I have spent many years on a small family farm. A drought caused us to lose everything we had on that family farm and due to brucellosis, we lost everything in our cattle business. I loved agriculture and the soil so much that I went off and majored in agriculture at Oklahoma State University, our land grant university.

I stand here today to plead with my colleagues to listen very closely to what is being offered, because I truly believe as I stand in this well today

that if we want to save the family farmer in the United States of America, we need to vote for the Volkmer mandatory set-aside or the Bedell voluntary set-aside program. If we are going to improve the agriculture income in America, if we are going to be able to allow the family farmer to exist and survive, the farmer must be able to make a profit.

The policy that is being offered on set aside is not new, other agricultural commodities have a quota or limit on production.

It would be a new direction for wheat, corn, and feed grains, but it is not new in other commodities and it has worked in other commodities.

I plead with my colleagues who may be wondering what to do with this farm bill, to listen carefully, because if we move in this direction, we can assist the farmer to receive a profit on less acreage with the set-aside. The farmer will be able to survive.

Some people will say, well, we can give them more loans and more credit. The farmer does not need more loans and more credit. They have got to have a profit. In our rural areas of this country today, we have a desperate economic crisis on the family farm.

The small rural communities are facing a disaster, not just a family farmer, but the rural communities of this country. The rural businesses are facing bankruptcies, more bankruptcies of farm implement dealerships than at any time since the Great Depression. Businesses are going under. They are not going to be able to survive unless the farmer has a profit so he can pay his bills.

There have been more bank closures than at any other time since the Great Depression. There have been over 230 banks closed in the last 4 years. The American Bankers Association will tell you today that there are 1,138 problem banks in rural America and throughout this country. Most of them are agriculture related banks. The bank cannot survive unless the farmer makes a profit.

The farm credit system in this Nation is facing drastic losses. There are \$220 billion out there in farm credit and \$75 billion of that is with the farm credit system. The farm credit system will have to be bailed out. Why? Because the farmer for many years has not had a profit. They have got to have a profit. In the past they have been able to stay in business because the equity of their land has increased for 40 years. But what has happened in the last 4 years? Not since the Great Depression have we seen land prices go down 4 years in a row, when most farmers in rural America today have lost 50 percent of their equity.



They cannot refinance. They have got to have a profit. They cannot continue.

I plead with my colleagues to realize that only the Volkmer amendment or the Bedell amendment will allow them to move to a profitable picture. They have got to have a profit in rural America or you are tearing the fiber apart in America. That is not the way we want to go in this country.

As I mentioned, 4 years of deflation has caused the greatest number of farm foreclosures ever to take place since the Great Depression. The only way we can turn it around is with these amendments.

The over-valued dollar has increased 45 percent in the last 5 years which has put a tariff on any exports of agricultural commodities overseas. The farmer cannot compete with the other countries under those conditions.

I ask you two questions, two questions to the people of America and to my colleagues: One, how long can a nuclear submarine stay under water? A nuclear submarine can stay under water for eternity as long as the crew has food, only if they have food.

Then I ask one other question to the people in this body and across America. Is a farm agricultural industry important or necessary to the national security of our country? I submit to you the answer is "Yes." If you agree then the only way we can have the family farmer survive and the family unit to survive would be to pass the Volkmer amendment or the Bedell amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I rise in support of the Smith amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I will be brief. It does seem to me that the effort to provide American farmers an opportunity to choose or vote on the plan that affects their lives as much as any that our Government applies to them is appropriate. I think it is appropriate to give them a voice and an opportunity to choose.

I think the amendment of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH] does that and is well worth consideration of this body.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard two impassioned pleas for a new method of determining what should happen in agriculture in America. I suggest that we agree with the results of all those impassioned pleas, that agriculture indeed is in deep trouble; yet those same pleas were offered to the members of the Agriculture Committee. I suggest that if they had been adopted,

then they would be part of the agricultural bill, which they are not, and it would be part of the referendum that I am proposing to make to the people in agriculture and to the farmers of America.

Obviously, those offers, those amendments, were not adopted by the Committee on Agriculture.

While we are talking about the Volkmer amendment, let me point out from a study done by the University of Missouri and Iowa State University about the 1985 farm bill, that if you want to get to 80 percent parity, and that is close to the Volkmer amendment, you must address your set-aside to 43 percent of the utilization, which means, by the way, that is an increase from 35 percent in the Volkmer amendment to 43 percent.

Then I must point to another part of the bill that has not been mentioned. That is simply that the bill also allows, the Volkmer amendment also allows the Secretary of Agriculture to insert quotas in addition to the set-asides if there are surpluses building.

□ 1715

I suggest that since 1981 we have had a 30 percent set-aside with surpluses building all the while. The question is: At 35 percent are we going to have surpluses building? The answer is yes.

The next question: How far will the Secretary go under your authorization of Volkmer in quotas? He will go as far as he needs to to stop surpluses from building. That means, I think, that we may well be at 50 percent set-aside, and I suggest that no farmer in America, if he cannot live on his farm now, can live on half his farm, and that is what we are doing.

My amendment, I again reiterate, brings the best that we can find from the Committee on Agriculture to the people of America. It brings the best. We have had these offers of amendments. We have had these other thoughts. They have not been adopted.

We want the people of America to vote on a farm bill. We want it to be the best consensus of minds we can find, and that is what I am proposing and that is what I would like to return to the people in America.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

It was my honor several years ago to serve on the House Committee on Agriculture, and with many of the gentlemen who have spoken today on the problems facing American agriculture. Representing a district, as I do, in central and western Illinois with strong agricultural resources and major agricultural problems, I can certainly identify with this debate. I see it every weekend when I return to the district

and I have felt it in the economy of the district and I have certainly felt it in terms of the people who come to visit my office in despair over the present state of agriculture in America.

It is with some reluctance that I rise today in opposition to the Volkmer amendment. I want to salute my colleague from Missouri across the river for his ingenuity in proposing a new idea in agriculture. Although this might have been hinted at in previous programs, this is a departure from American agricultural policy. What he has suggested in terms of a mandatory referendum strikes us out on a new path, but I believe in voting against the Volkmer amendment today and I hope my colleagues would agree that it is a path which we should not follow for the following reasons:

If we are going to undertake a program to try and maintain a price level for American farmers by restricting production, we will have to accept the consequences of that program. The consequences will not be limited to the farm itself. The consequences will be felt all across America, in rural and urban areas. This is not a solution for farmers that will be borne solely by farmers. It is a solution that all America will pay for.

An analysis which I believe is one that should be commended to all the Members was done by the University of Missouri and the University of Iowa. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH] referred to it a few minutes ago. It analyzed an 80-percent parity proposal, which is slightly higher than what the gentleman from Missouri is suggesting, but I believe that analysis is topical for our discussion today.

If we pursue a mandatory control program, as the gentleman from Missouri suggests, if we try to assume that we are going to hit a level of parity by supply control, here is what we accept: By the year 1990, America's agricultural exports will decline by one-third—one-third. We will be removing ourselves from the world market. We will become domestic producers and domestic consumers.

What we will do by raising the price level in the United States is to set a higher level for our competitors to reach, and what will it mean? It will mean that countries around the globe will decide that perhaps that marginal acreage can now be put in tillable production because the price level that the United States seeks to set is one that they can produce at and turn a profit and put more acreage under production. What it means is more competition for us abroad as we withdraw from the world market.

As we withdraw acreage from production to keep a high price level, we will also see unemployment increase in

the United States. There will be less production, fewer materials used by our farmers, rural communities—and the gentleman from Oklahoma mentioned earlier the impact of today's farm economy on rural communities, and I have seen it—but consider if we take 45 percent of our land out of production how much business they will have to do at the bank in the rural community, how much business there will be at the seed and fertilizer dealer, how many people will be making tractors. Even fewer than today, I am afraid.

As we restrict imports, which is a necessary element in this program, we will see the emergence of another factor, the emergence of a major Government agency. There have been disparaging remarks about the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and I can always draw an applause in my district by suggesting that as well. But if we pass a mandatory control program, we will be creating a police department in the U.S. Department of Agriculture to go about this country and make certain that every producer is not producing beyond his or her quota.

The farmers who value their independence will see those days long gone. Instead, they will see a police action to keep their acreage under control far more than what they see today.

Finally, there is a suggestion that consumer prices would increase 20 to 25 percent. I am not a person who suggests that the American consumers do not have the best deal in the world. They do. We have a variety and a price which other countries envy. But this kind of increase over a short period of time will necessarily bring about a backlash from the rest of America outside of rural America that will see this program quickly abandoned.

I rise in opposition to the Volkmer proposal. I believe that although it addresses this problem with a unique and innovative approach, it is not the approach which we should follow today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] has expired.

(On request of Mr. VOLKMER and by unanimous consent, Mr. DURBIN was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire whether the gentleman realizes that under the bill as it is drafted and before you on the export programs, we have provisions for export subsidy-type programs that will take care of the export markets, and the studies

that have been made on that indicate that the exports will not necessarily decline to the extent that the gentleman proposes. That study was made by the University of Missouri without any export subsidies being taken into consideration.

Mr. DURBIN. I might say to the gentleman that if we are going to embark on an export subsidy program to make up the difference between the world price and some effort to reach parity, we are also embarking on a very expensive program.

Mr. VOLKMER. It is shown that it is cheaper, and the CBO has done a study on it, than what we are doing in the bill and what undoubtedly the gentleman may support. Budgetwise, it is easier to subsidize one-third or 30 percent of corn production than it is 100 percent of it.

Mr. DURBIN. I might suggest to the gentleman that the impact of reducing the acreage under production 45 percent of the corn acreage, for example, in the United States would have a devastating negative impact.

Mr. VOLKMER. It is not 45 percent. It is 20 percent on corn.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MARLENEE. I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman on his remarks and insight into the problems that are created with this kind of an approach to supply management, this kind of an approach to exports, this kind of an approach to trying to give the producers a program that they can understand and live with.

The gentleman's reference to a police state should be well taken, because I have lived through the mandatory control programs. That was one of the reasons that they were voted down a number of years ago, because of the problems that occurred there.

I certainly commend the gentleman and wish to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURBIN. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Volkmer amendment. I do so for a very simple, albeit important reason, that reason is "price."

The bottom line on success or failure for us as we draft farm policy during the next 4 years will be a simple question, "What did we do to improve price?"

Improving price and thereby income is what must be our ultimate, in fact, our only major priority.

More than any other amendment, more than even the bill itself, this

amendment will allow us to accomplish this goal.

Yet it set prices at rates below even what they were during the midseventies. Prices, I would add, that were increasing at the very time our exports were increasing and at the same time that livestock prices were reaching all-time highs.

And we provide the opportunity at long last, to increase income at dramatically reduced cost to the Federal Government.

This amendment will not give farmers larger subsidies. It will not give them fancy, complicated and confusing new programs with which to control. It will not be the final solution to the grave difficulties we face in agriculture.

But it is a start. It is a major improvement to the bill. I does do what we need to do most. It gives us a price. It deserves the support of the House.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman that this is not a new policy. We are using this policy basically in several other commodities with some deviation.

Mr. DURBIN. Peanuts, for example?

Mr. WATKINS. Peanuts and tobacco, and we have quotas for milk and various things like that. It is the only way we can get production in line and also allow a profit to be made on the farm.

I was taught in 4-H and FFA to grow two blades of grass in place of one, and four in place of one, if possible. We did just that when we had an acreage-type allotment, but when we finally applied poundage quota or a bushel quota or a tonnage quota on the programs it worked. That is the only way basically we could get everything in line.

We have done a good job producing but let me say this is not basically a new policy but this is a policy that I think definitely would move our farmers toward a profitable picture in agriculture and it is definitely needed, because the situation is very grave today, in rural America as the gentleman knows.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I would like to speak very briefly in opposition to the Smith amendment.

To be very brief, it appears to me, after reviewing the Smith amendment, that it really would do away completely with the mandatory program amendment; that it is meant basically as what some of us used to call in legislative parlance back in the State legislature as a killer amendment because



all it really does is replace it with a referendum on existing programs.

What the gentleman from Oregon could have proposed at any other place in the bill did not have to be done in opposition to the Volkmer amendment.

□ 1725

I think if you want a clearcut vote up or down on the Volkmer mandatory program, then we should defeat the amendment of the gentleman from Oregon.

I also feel very strongly that since it does impact on cotton and rice, et cetera, and many of the people from those areas do not wish to have a referendum on those programs, I feel very strongly that we should defeat the amendment of the gentleman from Oregon.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER], as amended.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXIII, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the pending question following the quorum call. Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 324]

Ackerman	Boggs	Clay
Akaka	Boland	Clinger
Alexander	Boner (TN)	Coats
Anderson	Bonior (MI)	Cobey
Andrews	Borski	Coble
Annunzio	Bosco	Coelho
Applegate	Boucher	Coleman (MO)
Archer	Boulter	Coleman (TX)
Armey	Boxer	Combest
Aspin	Breaux	Conte
Atkins	Brooks	Conyers
AuCoin	Broomfield	Cooper
Badham	Brown (CA)	Coughlin
Barnard	Brown (CO)	Courter
Barnes	Broyhill	Coyne
Bartlett	Bruce	Craig
Barton	Bryant	Crane
Bateman	Burton (CA)	Daniel
Bates	Burton (IN)	Dannemeyer
Bedell	Bustamante	Darden
Bellenson	Byron	Daschle
Bennett	Callahan	Daub
Bentley	Campbell	Davis
Bereuter	Carper	de la Garza
Berman	Carr	DeLay
Bevill	Chandler	Dellums
Biaggi	Chapman	DeWine
Bilirakis	Chappell	Dickinson
Bliley	Chappie	Dicks
Boehrlert	Cheney	Dingell

DioGuardi	Kanjorski	Ortiz
Dixon	Kaptur	Owens
Donnelly	Kasich	Oxley
Dorgan (ND)	Kastenmeier	Packard
Dornan (CA)	Kemp	Panetta
Dowdy	Kennelly	Parris
Downey	Kildee	Pashayan
Dreier	Kindness	Pease
Duncan	Kiecicka	Penny
Durbin	Kolbe	Pepper
Dwyer	Kolter	Perkins
Dymally	Kostmayer	Petri
Dyson	Kramer	Pickle
Early	LaFalce	Porter
Eckart (OH)	Lagomarsino	Price
Eckert (NY)	Lantos	Pursell
Edgar	Latta	Quillen
Edwards (CA)	Leach (IA)	Rahall
Edwards (OK)	Leath (TX)	Rangel
Emerson	Lehman (CA)	Ray
English	Lehman (FL)	Regula
Erdreich	Leland	Reid
Evans (IA)	Lent	Richardson
Evans (IL)	Levin (MI)	Ridge
Fascell	Levine (CA)	Rinaldo
Fawell	Lewis (CA)	Ritter
Fazio	Lewis (FL)	Roberts
Feighan	Lightfoot	Robinson
Fiedler	Lipinski	Rodino
Fields	Livingston	Roe
Fish	Lloyd	Roemer
Flippo	Loeffler	Rogers
Florio	Long	Rose
Foglietta	Lott	Rostenkowski
Foley	Lowery (CA)	Roth
Ford (MI)	Lowry (WA)	Roukema
Ford (TN)	Lujan	Rowland (GA)
Fowler	Luken	Roybal
Frank	Lundine	Rudd
Franklin	Lungren	Russo
Frenzel	Mack	Sabo
Fuqua	MacKay	Savage
Gallo	Madigan	Saxton
Garcia	Manton	Schaefer
Gaydos	Markey	Scheuer
Gejdenson	Marlenee	Schneider
Gekas	Martin (IL)	Schroeder
Gephardt	Martin (NY)	Schuette
Gibbons	Martinez	Schulze
Gilman	Matsui	Schumer
Gingrich	Mavroules	Seiberling
Glickman	Mazzoli	Sensenbrenner
Gonzalez	McCain	Shaw
Goodling	McCandless	Shelby
Gordon	McCloskey	Shumway
Gradison	McCollum	Shuster
Gray (IL)	McCurdy	Sikorski
Gregg	McDade	Siljander
Grotberg	McEwen	Sisisky
Guarini	McGrath	Skeen
Gunderson	McHugh	Skelton
Hall (OH)	McKernan	Slatery
Hall, Ralph	McKinney	Slaughter
Hamilton	McMillan	Smith (FL)
Hammerschmidt	Meyers	Smith (IA)
Hansen	Mica	Smith (NE)
Hartnett	Michel	Smith (NJ)
Hatcher	Mikulski	Smith, Denny
Hawkins	Miller (CA)	(OR)
Hayes	Miller (OH)	Smith, Robert
Hefner	Miller (WA)	(NH)
Heftel	Mineta	Smith, Robert
Hendon	Molinari	(OR)
Henry	Mollohan	Snowe
Hertel	Monson	Snyder
Hiller	Montgomery	Solarz
Hillis	Moody	Solomon
Holt	Moore	Spence
Hopkins	Moorhead	Spratt
Horton	Morrison (CT)	St Germain
Howard	Morrison (WA)	Staggers
Hoyer	Mrazek	Stallings
Hubbard	Murphy	Stangeland
Huckaby	Murtha	Stark
Hughes	Myers	Stenholm
Hunter	Natcher	Stokes
Hutto	Neal	Strang
Hyde	Nelson	Stratton
Ireland	Nichols	Studds
Jacobs	Nielson	Stump
Jeffords	Nowak	Sundquist
Jenkins	O'Brien	Sweeney
Johnson	Oakar	Swift
Jones (NC)	Oberstar	Swindall
Jones (OK)	Obey	Synar
Jones (TN)	Olin	Tallon

Tauke	Visclosky	Wirth
Tauzin	Volkmer	Wise
Taylor	Vucanovich	Wolf
Thomas (CA)	Walgren	Wolpe
Thomas (GA)	Walker	Wortley
Torres	Watkins	Wright
Torricelli	Weaver	Wyden
Towns	Weber	Wylie
Trafigant	Weiss	Yates
Traxler	Wheat	Yatron
Udall	Whitley	Young (AK)
Valentine	Whittaker	Young (FL)
Vander Jagt	Whitten	Young (MO)
Vento	Wilson	Zschau

□ 1740

The CHAIRMAN. Four hundred seventeen Members have answered to their names, a quorum is present, and the Committee will resume its business.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH] for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 107, noes 319, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 325]

AYES—107

Ackerman	Hansen	Packard
Anderson	Hopkins	Parris
Applegate	Hubbard	Regula
Bartlett	Ireland	Roberts
Bentley	Jeffords	Rogers
Bereuter	Kasich	Roth
Bilirakis	Kemp	Rudd
Boehrlert	Kindness	Schaefer
Boulter	Kramer	Schroeder
Broomfield	Lagomarsino	Sensenbrenner
Brown (CO)	Leach (IA)	Shaw
Burton (IN)	Lent	Shumway
Chandler	Lewis (CA)	Siljander
Chappie	Lewis (FL)	Skeen
Cheney	Lightfoot	Smith (NE)
Coble	Lott	Smith, Denny
Combest	Lujan	(OR)
Conte	Lundine	Smith, Robert
Craig	Madigan	(OR)
Daub	Marlenee	Snowe
Davis	Martin (IL)	Snyder
DeWine	Martin (NY)	Solarz
Dreier	Mazzoli	Solomon
Edwards (OK)	McCollum	Stangeland
Emerson	McDade	Strang
Fiedler	McEwen	Sweeney
Fish	McKernan	Tauke
Franklin	Meyers	Taylor
Frenzel	Michel	Vander Jagt
Gekas	Miller (OH)	Whitehurst
Gibbons	Monson	Whittaker
Gilman	Montgomery	Wolf
Gingrich	Moorhead	Wylie
Goodling	Morrison (WA)	Young (AK)
Grotberg	Myers	Young (FL)
Gunderson	Nielson	
Hammerschmidt	O'Brien	

NOES—319

Akaka	Bennett	Bryant
Alexander	Berman	Burton (CA)
Andrews	Bevill	Bustamante
Annunzio	Biaggi	Byron
Anthony	Bliley	Callahan
Archer	Boggs	Campbell
Armey	Boland	Carper
Aspin	Boner (TN)	Carr
Atkins	Bonior (MI)	Chapman
AuCoin	Borski	Chappell
Badham	Bosco	Clay
Barnard	Boucher	Clinger
Barnes	Boxer	Coats
Barton	Breaux	Cobey
Bateman	Brooks	Coelho
Bates	Brown (CA)	Coleman (MO)
Bedell	Broyhill	Coleman (TX)
Bellenson	Bruce	Collins

Conyers	Hyde	Reid
Cooper	Jacobs	Richardson
Coughlin	Jenkins	Ridge
Courter	Johnson	Rinaldo
Coyne	Jones (NC)	Ritter
Crane	Jones (OK)	Robinson
Crockett	Jones (TN)	Rodino
Daniel	Kanjorski	Roe
Dannemeyer	Kaptur	Roemer
Darden	Kastenmeier	Rose
Daschle	Kennelly	Rostenkowski
de la Garza	Kildee	Roukema
DeLay	Klecicka	Rowland (GA)
Dellums	Kolbe	Roybal
Derrick	Kolter	Russo
Dickinson	Kostmayer	Sabo
Dicks	LaFalce	Savage
Dingell	Lantos	Saxton
DioGuardi	Latta	Scheuer
Dixon	Leath (TX)	Schneider
Donnelly	Lehman (CA)	Schuetz
Dorgan (ND)	Lehman (FL)	Schulze
Dornan (CA)	Leland	Schumer
Dowdy	Levin (MI)	Seiberling
Downey	Levine (CA)	Shelby
Duncan	Lipinski	Shuster
Durbin	Livingston	Sikorski
Dwyer	Lloyd	Sisisky
Dymally	Loeffler	Skelton
Dyson	Long	Slatery
Early	Lowery (CA)	Slaughter
Eckart (OH)	Lowry (WA)	Smith (FL)
Eckert (NY)	Luken	Smith (IA)
Edgar	Lungren	Smith (NJ)
Edwards (CA)	Mack	Smith, Robert
English	MacKay	(NH)
Erdreich	Manton	Spence
Evans (IA)	Markey	Spratt
Evans (IL)	Martinez	St Germain
Fascell	Matsui	Staggers
Fawell	Mavroules	Stallings
Fazio	McCain	Stark
Felghan	McCloskey	Stenholm
Fields	McCurdy	Stokes
Flippo	McGrath	Stratton
Florio	McHugh	Studds
Foglietta	McKinney	Stump
Foley	McMillan	Sundquist
Ford (MI)	Mica	Swift
Ford (TN)	Mikulski	Swindall
Fowler	Miller (CA)	Synar
Frank	Miller (WA)	Tallon
Frost	Mineta	Tauzin
Fuqua	Mitchell	Thomas (CA)
Gallo	Molinari	Thomas (GA)
Garcia	Mollohan	Torres
Gaydos	Moody	Torricelli
Gejdenson	Moore	Towns
Gephardt	Morrison (CT)	Traficant
Glickman	Mrazek	Traxler
Gonzalez	Murphy	Udall
Gordon	Murtha	Valentine
Gradison	Natcher	Vento
Gray (IL)	Neal	Visclosky
Gray (PA)	Nelson	Volkmmer
Gregg	Nichols	Vucanovich
Guarini	Nowak	Walgren
Hall (OH)	Oakar	Walker
Hall, Ralph	Oberstar	Watkins
Hamilton	Obey	Waxman
Hartnett	Olin	Weaver
Hatcher	Ortiz	Weber
Hawkins	Owens	Weiss
Hayes	Oxley	Wheat
Hefner	Panetta	Whitley
Heffel	Pashayan	Whitten
Hendon	Pease	Williams
Henry	Penny	Wilson
Hertel	Pepper	Wirth
Hiler	Perkins	Wise
Hillis	Petri	Wolpe
Holt	Pickle	Wortley
Horton	Porter	Wright
Howard	Price	Wyden
Hoyer	Pursell	Yates
Huckaby	Quillen	Yatron
Hughes	Rahall	Young (MO)
Hunter	Rangel	Zschau
Hutto	Ray	

## NOT VOTING—8

Addabbo	Green	Rowland (CT)
Bonker	McCandless	Sharp
Carney	Moakley	

□ 1750

Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MACK, and Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment to the amendment, as amended, was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. EVANS OF ILLINOIS TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VOLKMER, AS AMENDED

Mr. EVANS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EVANS of Illinois to the amendment offered by Mr. VOLKMER, as amended: Strike out section 514 and insert in lieu thereof the following new section:

## "FARM PRODUCTION ACREAGES

"Sec. 514. (a) The national production acreage for a commodity shall be apportioned by the Secretary among farms, through local committees, in accordance with this section.

"(b)(1) To be eligible to receive a farm production acreage for a commodity for any crop year, a producer must complete and submit to the Secretary an application which contains—

"(A) the eligible crop acres of the producer, as determined under paragraph (2); and

"(B) the average annual gross farm program income by producers of such commodity during the five preceding crop years (excluding the highest and lowest years), as determined under paragraph (3).

"(2)(A) Except as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (C), the eligible crop acres of a producer shall equal the number of acres a producer requests to cultivate for the production of commodities during a crop year.

"(B) The total number of eligible crop acres of a producer during a crop year may not exceed the product obtained by multiplying—

"(i) the normal crop acres of the producer; by

"(ii) 80 per centum.

"(C) For purposes of subparagraph (B)(i), if a producer places acreage in the conservation reserve program established under section 16B of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, such acreage shall be added to the normal crop acres of the producer.

"(c) The total farm production acreage of a producer for all commodities produced during a crop year under this section shall consist of the base farm production acreage for each commodity determined under subsection (d).

"(d)(1) The base farm production acreage of a producer for a commodity for a crop year shall equal the number of acres obtained by multiplying—

"(A) eligible crop acres of the producer; by

"(B) production acreage apportionment factor of the producer.

"(2) As used in this section, the term 'production acreage apportionment factor' means a percentage obtained by dividing \$200,000 by the average annual gross farm program income by producers of such commodity during the five preceding crop years (excluding the highest and lowest years), except that such percentage may not exceed 100 per centum.

"(e) Notwithstanding subsection (d), the farm production acreage of a producer—

"(1) in the case of each crop of wheat shall be no less than 60 per centum of the farm's crop acreage base for wheat; and

"(2) in the case of each crop of feed grains, shall be no less than 70 per centum of the farm's crop acreage base for food grains.

"(f)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), a producer may plant one or more commodities (in the producer's discretion) on acreage permitted to be cultivated under a farm production acreage issued under this section for a crop year.

"(2) Notwithstanding section 605, for any crop of wheat or feed grains for which a national marketing certificate program is approved under section 515, no producer of such crop may adjust the producer's crop acreage base for the crop as provided for in section 605, and the producer's base for such crop shall be as determined under title VI without regard to section 605.

"(3) In order to permit the Secretary to issue marketing certificates under section 531, a producer shall inform the Secretary of the number of acres the producer will use for the production of each commodity during each crop year.

"(g) If the normal crop acres of a producer becomes available for any reason, such normal crop acres shall revert to the Secretary and be reapportioned by the Secretary to the next operator of the farm.

"(h) Subject to the provisions of section 535(b) of this title, whenever a wheat or feed grain production acreage for a crop is established for a farm, other than for a crop which the producers on the farm use for on-farm feeding purposes and which the producers on the farm certify in writing will be used exclusively for on-farm feeding purposes during the period for which a national production acreage is in effect, under this section, the producers on the farm may not plant an acreage on the farm to the commodity for harvest for the crop in excess of the farm's production acreage for the commodity; and with respect to farms with a crop acreage base for the commodity and crop involved of less than fifteen acres, producers on the farm may not plant an acreage on the farm to the commodity for harvest for the crop in excess of fifteen acres.

In section 535 of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following new subsection:

"(f) If any land is required to be set aside, diverted, or otherwise not cultivated under the provisions of a program under this title, the producer shall satisfy such requirement to the extent possible with highly erodible cropland (as defined in section 1201 of the Food Security Act of 1985). Any such highly erodible land so set aside, diverted, or not cultivated, during a period of four succeeding crop years shall be excluded from any crop acreage base for any program crop (as computed under section 604 of the Agricultural Act of 1949).

Mr. EVANS of Illinois (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?



Mr. EVANS of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADIGAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman we have had the opportunity to review his amendment. I think it is a good amendment, and have no objection on this side.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVANS of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am more than willing to accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. EVANS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, today I am offering an amendment to the Volkmer amendment which would do two things:

Refine the Volkmer amendment so that it will better target its program to mid-size, family farmers;

And ensure that the acreage set aside under the program offered by Mr. Volkmer includes the most highly erodible land.

My friend from the State of Missouri supports this amendment which seeks to improve an already solid proposal.

Currently, small and mid-size farms receive significantly less than large farms in both direct benefits under the Federal Farm Program, and indirect benefits in the form of higher prices. Large producers should benefit from higher commodity prices as do other farmers. However, we have to question the wisdom and equity of allowing 22 percent of our direct program benefits to go to large producers who make up only 4.5 percent of all farmers.

My amendment in no way undermines the large producer. What it does do is make sure that under the producer-approved wheat and feedgrain program, large producers assume a fair share of the responsibility of cutting our Nation's soaring commodity surplus.

Under my amendment, every wheat and feedgrain producer would be required to set aside 20 percent of their crop base. Those farmers who exceed a specific level of gross farm program income would be required to set aside a progressively larger share of their crop base. The set-aside for wheat producers would be capped at 40 percent of their base acreage, while the set-aside for corn and producers of other feedgrains would be capped at 30 percent of the producer's crop base.

This is fair for two reasons:

First, those producers who must set aside additional acreage are also the producers who are reaping the greatest benefits from the Federal Farm Program. To be specific, they would be the farmers who receive over \$200,000 in gross farm program income. It is entirely reasonable that these individuals do their part to reduce the huge surplus of wheat and feedgrains that our Government and taxpayers must contend with.

In pure numbers, this amendment would affect only a small percentage of our Nation's farmers. Nevertheless, it is these

farms which should make additional cut-backs if needed, not our hard-pressed small and mid-size farms.

Second, and most importantly, this targeting provision would boost the farm income of all producers. After all, right now, about 50 percent of all farm income goes to this 4.5 percent of farmers. Our family farms and our large producers, even those very small few who might have to set aside 40 percent of their crop base, would see greater farm income than under the current farm program.

Targeting benefits also makes sense in light of our farm crisis. The large majority of farm debt is held by the mid-size farmers. By targeting benefits, we can help ease the credit crisis, and not waste needed benefits on those large producers that can already make it just fine.

The second part of my amendment would require that set-aside lands under the Volkmer proposal include all highly-erodible lands. This provision is supported by many environmental organizations including the Sierra Club and the American Farmland Trust. It is in the best interests of our Nation in terms of reduced soil erosion and water pollution that such lands are set aside. Yet, in some cases, this highly erodible land is also very productive, thereby reducing a farmer's incentive to set it aside. This provision protects the long-term productive interests of our Nation's farmers, and the ability of our country to supply adequate food for our citizens for generations to come.

As you know, both Houses of Congress have agreed to provisions in their farm legislation which would establish a long-term conservation reserve. My amendment, by setting aside highly erodible acres under the Volkmer proposal, provides a strong incentive for our farmers to participate in the conservation reserve.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment to strengthen the efforts by the gentleman from Missouri to turn around our country's farm economy.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] as amended.

The amendment to the amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER], as amended.

The amendment as amended, was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title VA?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BEDELL

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment that takes care of some concerns that the Committee on Ways and Means had.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BEDELL: On page 115, line 5, redesignate paragraph (1)

as subparagraph (1)(A). On page 115, after line 13, insert a new subparagraph (B) as follows:

"(B) The Secretary may make available to importers marketing certificates for wheat or wheat products imported during the marketing year for any of the 1986 through 1990 crops of wheat for which a national marketing certificate program is in effect. The quantities of such imported wheat or wheat products shall not exceed the amount that may be imported under restrictions resulting from the imposition of measures under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937."

On page 115, line 14, redesignate paragraph (2) as subparagraph (2)(A). On page 115, after line 23, insert a new subparagraph (B) as follows:

"(B) A marketing certificate applicable to a quantity of wheat or wheat products issued to an importer shall authorize such importer to market, barter, or donate, without restriction, an amount of wheat or wheat products equal to the amount of such marketing certificate. Wheat or wheat products may not be marketed, bartered, or donated domestically by an importer without a marketing certificate."

On Page 116, strike line 21 and all that follows thereafter through line 24, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(5) Marketing certificates made available to a producer or an importer of wheat or wheat products shall not be transferable, except to the extent that such certificates accompany wheat or wheat products that are marketed, bartered, or donated under paragraph (2), and any such transfer that does not accompany wheat or wheat products shall render such certificates null and void."

On Page 120, line 4, redesignate paragraph (1) as subparagraph (1)(A). On Page 120, after line 13, insert a new subparagraph (B) as follows:

"(B) The Secretary may make available to importers marketing certificates for feed grains or feed grain products imported during the marketing year for any of the 1986 through 1990 crops of feed grains for which a national marketing certificate program is in effect. The quantities of such imported feed grains or feed grain products shall not exceed the amount that may be imported under restrictions resulting from the imposition of measures under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937."

On Page 120, line 14, redesignate paragraph (2) as subparagraph (2)(A). On page 120, after line 23, insert a new subparagraph (B) as follows:

"(B) A marketing certificate applicable to a quantity of feed grains or feed grain products issued to an importer shall authorize such importer to market, barter, or donate, without restriction, an amount of feed grains or feed grain products equal to the amount of such marketing certificate. Feed grains or feed grain products may not be marketed, bartered, or donated domestically by an importer without a marketing certificate."

On Page 121, strike line 21 and all that follows thereafter through line 24, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(5) Marketing certificates made available to a producer or an importer of feed grains or feed grain products shall not be transferable, except to the extent that such certificates accompany feed grains or feed grain

products that are marketed, bartered, or donated under paragraph (2), and any such transfer that does not accompany feed grains or feed grain products shall render such certificates null and void."

Mr. BEDELL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this takes care of a jurisdictional conflict between our committee and the Committee on Ways and Means. After diligent effort between the staffs and the respective chairmen, the end result is this amendment which would satisfy the Committee on Ways and Means and would do no harm to our committee version, and I would urge the Members to accept it.

Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEDELL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADIGAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I understand this is a compromise that has been worked out with the Committee on Ways and Means that removes the objections, some if not all of the objections, that they had to the referendum proposal of the gentleman from Iowa in the bill.

Mr. BEDELL. That is correct.

Mr. MADIGAN. I am opposed to the referendum and intend to move to strike it, but I have no objection to this amendment being adopted to it.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. BEDELL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RUSSO. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. Chairman, did the gentleman [Mr. BEDELL] discuss this amendment with the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. BEDELL. I have discussed it with the staff, and they have discussed it.

Mr. RUSSO. And there was no objection?

Mr. BEDELL. This is what they want to see.

Mr. RUSSO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BEDELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MADIGAN

Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MADIGAN, title VA, strike out line 1, page 110 and all that follows thereafter through line 14, page 124.

Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Chairman, this is the most controversial part of the farm bill that is before the Committee of the Whole this afternoon, because I just offered a motion to strike a provision that was adopted in the committee by a 22-to-18 vote with members of both parties voting on both sides of the issue.

The issue is whether or not the bill will contain a provision for a farmer referendum on the corn and wheat crops that would allow all corn farmers and all wheat farmers to vote in a referendum regardless of the size of their operation, regardless of whether or not they are working farmers or hobby farmers, and each would have the same vote.

#### □ 1805

In community property States, Mr. Chairman, the wife of the farmer would have a vote, as well, but in non-community property States, the wife of the farmer would not have a vote. In other words, a computer salesman with 40 acres of corn would have the same vote as the working farmer with 600 acres of corn, and the computer salesman, if he lived in a community property State, would have a wife that could vote in this referendum, but the full-time working farmer in another State not a community property State would have a wife that would not be able to vote in a referendum.

This is portrayed as being an imposition of a voluntary program as a result of this referendum, but in fact if the referendum were adopted, a farmer who chose not to participate in the program would not be able to sell the commodity that he produced in the United States of America. Thus, the voluntary nature, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, is clearly a misnomer.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, a livestock producer, a pork producer, a poultry producer or a dairy farmer who is required to buy a substantial amount of their feed under the provisions of this referendum would be at a competitive disadvantage not only with those who can grow their own but also those who might be in the same position immediately across the border in Canada or Mexico who would be able under the terms of this referendum to buy United States grain in Mexico cheaper than a livestock grower or pork producer or a dairy farmer could buy U.S. grain in the United States.

Under the provisions of this referendum, exports would be subsidized, which would mean that U.S. grain would sell cheaper in Moscow than it

would sell in Kansas City or in Chicago.

This referendum also would establish that in the growing year of 1986 there would be a 30-percent set-aside of all the wheat acres in the United States and a 20-percent set-aside of all the corn acres in the United States. But in the crop years 1987 through 1990, if the carryover crop exceeded certain levels, under the provisions of the referendum, if the carryover crop for corn exceeds 1.100 billion bushels, and for wheat exceed 800 million, then the Secretary of Agriculture in the subsequent crop years 1987 through 1990 can determine on his own what the set-aside requirement will be.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture tells us that if this referendum were adopted, in crop year 1987 the set-aside required for wheat would be 50 percent of the wheat growers' acres and 40 percent of the corn growers' acres.

The referendum has the effect of taking out of production some of the most fertile land in the United States in a very mandatory way and keeping in production some of the most fragile and highly erodible land in the United States, completely frustrating any attempt to get that highly erodible and fragile land out of production. It institutionalizes that situation and has as an effect an absolute transfer of land values from fertile land to less fertile land.

Let me very quickly recap what I have said. Who would vote in this referendum? A hobby farmer would have the same vote as a working farmer. A hobby farmer's wife in a community property State would also have a vote. A working farmer's wife in a noncommunity property State would not have a vote.

It is advertised as a voluntary program, but nonparticipants would not be able to sell their crops in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADIGAN] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MADIGAN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. MADIGAN. There will be subsidies paid to effect the export of grain to pork producers, livestock feeders, poultry feeders, other dairy people outside the United States, but no subsidies for the same kinds of people inside the United States.

As I said earlier, because of the export subsidies and the absence of any domestic subsidy, U.S. grain will sell cheaper in the Soviet Union than it will sell in the grain markets of the United States.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADIGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.



Mr. WEAVER. Will the gentleman agree to an amendment striking the export subsidy?

Mr. MADIGAN. I would agree to any amendment that the proponents of this bill want to make, but I would say to the gentleman—

Mr. WEAVER. No, no, no. Will the gentleman agree to striking the export subsidy?

Mr. MADIGAN. If the gentleman wants to offer an amendment to do that, I will not object to it, but I will point out at that point how it makes the program as unworkable to not have it as it does to have it. You do not gain anything. It becomes just as bad one way as the other.

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the hour is late. I know Members want to get away. I do not believe there is need to spend a lot of time debating this issue. I think people are well informed on the issue. I would point out that in this proposal it is exactly the same language as it is in the rest of the bill as far as the set-asides are concerned.

I would further point out that CBO estimates—and we said we have to go by CBO—are 20 percent set-aside.

As far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, we should proceed with a vote.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as does the gentleman from Iowa, I do not think we want to prolong the debate on this issue, but I think it is extremely important that the Members realize the importance of this amendment and what the author is trying to do.

It virtually guts what we have tried to do in the committee over the last 8 months. This will virtually assure that without the proper opportunity for farmers to vote, without the proper opportunity for farmers to obtain a good income, without the proper income for farmers themselves to ensure that they can be marketable in the export market, we severely dismantle a very important part of the bill.

So I would urge those who have been with the committee all along, I would urge those who really want to provide both marketability as well as good income and to do it at a time when we can come with below-the-budget level, that we do it now, and that we defeat the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois and that we ensure that we keep the bill intact and provide our goals, as we have so adroitly under the chairman's leadership.

I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ENGLISH].

Mr. ENGLISH. I, too, do not want to take a great deal of the Committee's time. I would like to say, very briefly,

though, that I rise in opposition to the amendment. I would simply like to say that we have two different philosophical approaches that are contained within the bill. Under the bill, we allow the farmers to make the decisions as to which direction they want to go. There is no time since the Great Depression that this has been so important to the American farmer as to what we are going to be doing within a farm bill. Let him decide the issue. Let him decide which way he wants to go philosophically. It is his fate that is going to be determined by that. With that, I would urge defeat of the amendment.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Chairman, if we want to be competitive on the export market, then clearly the Bedell provision will allow us to do that. If we want to provide better income to our farmers, then clearly the Bedell provision will allow us to do that. If we want to provide an opportunity to come in below the budget, then clearly the Bedell provision will allow us to do that.

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. How in the world by giving American livestock feeders dramatically higher cost of grains can you improve competitiveness? You destroy the competitiveness of American agriculture with this.

Mr. DASCHLE. I disagree with the gentleman from Colorado. I would say that the prices that we are offering in this amendment, in this part of the bill, I should say—it is not an amendment—are lower than what they were in the mid-1970's when export markets were increasing, when livestock prices were going up.

So clearly we are not even going back to where we were 10 years ago.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. If the gentleman will yield, the point is that cattle feeders in Mexico and Canada will enjoy dramatically lower feeding costs than they will in the United States, and our 4.2 billion export market of red meat and meat byproducts will be decimated by this bill.

If you are for the provision, I understand it. But please do not hang your hat on exports because this does away with an entire export industry.

Mr. DASCHLE. I disagree very strongly. It does not at all. In fact, I think it provides us the opportunity to be more competitive in the export market. I think it provides us an opportunity not only to ensure that our grain producers are going to do well but also to ensure that our livestock producers can come and enjoy the wealth, as we hope our grain feed producers will under this provision. So there is no question that if we want to keep viability in agriculture as a comprehensive goal, not only in livestock, not only in dairy, not only in cotton and rice, but also in wheat and feed

grains, then this provision is extremely important. I just hope that the House will see fit to defeat the Madigan amendment.

I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

Mr. PENNY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, rise to defend the Bedell provision to this farm bill because it is a provision which gives the farmers a chance to vote for better income. We are not going to get ourselves out of this farm crisis by giving farmers lower prices. This referendum plan gives the farmers a chance to vote for themselves to improve a price for their farm commodities.

Mr. DASCHLE. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the Madigan amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADIGAN].

Mr. MADIGAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, just very briefly I would like to respond to the gentleman from Iowa, who talked again about the estimates of the Congressional Budget Office, and say to the Members of the Committee of the Whole that I am reading from a letter addressed to me from the Congressional Budget Office under date of October 1, 1985, and that letter says:

The market assumptions underlying the most recent baselines suggest that the acreage reductions of 40 percent in wheat and 25 percent in feed grains would be required.

Now, that is absolutely contrary to what the gentleman from Iowa just quoted the CBO as saying.

This is from a letter addressed to me from the CBO under date of October 1.

Mr. EMERSON. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADIGAN] and say also that I fail to see how we can single out wheat and feed grains for a referendum when we just voted against a referendum to put the whole farm bill before the farmers to see whether our collective work product is acceptable or not.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in strong support of the Madigan amendment.

I wish there were a magic wand that we could wave and solve the income problems of agriculture that are so very real today. Unfortunately, there is no such wand. The Bedell provision theoretically would increase wheat farmers' income by \$277 million in 1986, corn farmers' income by \$1.5 billion, if you assume the same produc-

tion and no disruption of export or import markets.

While I strongly embrace and share in the goal of drafting farm legislation for a 1985 farm bill that will improve net farm income and return profitability to U.S. agriculture, I sincerely question the ability and probable direction generated by such a voluntary certificate approach. Do not misunderstand me. I can see that because demand is relatively inelastic, farm income would certainly increase for the first year, as I can see. Nobody argues that point. But before long the chickens will come home to roost.

□ 1820

Land and rental values would increase as bases would become capitalized. Witness tobacco and peanuts. The unemployment would spread throughout the rural economy because of a drastic production cutback. Foreign production would increase because of our higher domestic price levels. Furthermore, if we were to attempt to keep this mandatory program operating efficiently, I seriously doubt whether we could raise new import barriers quick enough to fight off the sudden influx of imported grain and products even with the Ways and Means acquiescence to the previous amendment.

I have serious questions regarding the workability and administration of such a program. The ASCS would be placed in a position to be investigator, judge, and jury in order to police and monitor this program compliance. Witness that what we are about to do if we allow this to happen, an individual corn farmer or wheat farmer in the United States will be unable to continue to produce for the domestic market unless he has a base, as evidence by the language of the gentleman's bill in 1985. Because we have struck that part of the basis and yield provision that we worked so hard on in the committee for so long.

Also witness that in the gentleman's amendment, if you happen to be a farmer-feeder, by that, if you happen to be growing your own grain and feeding it to your own cattle, you can produce fence row to fence row; no restrictions. Get as large as you want to. But if you happen to be a farmer who has been selling his grain to his neighbor down the street or down the road, you will be unable to continue unless you participate in the set-aside to sell to that individual.

Because some commodities would be controlled and some uncontrolled, Government-mandated set asides would soar in my opinion. Many markets would be jeopardized. Now, proponents of this approach have repeatedly stated that the new export subsidy program known as BICEP or something like it, would keep U.S. wheat and corn competitive in world mar-

kets. That program has generated one sale in the last 4 months. So I ask those that believe that somehow we are going to be able to craft an export subsidy program in the real world, why have we been unable to make it work for the past 4 months?

I, too, have serious doubts whether this Congress would be willing to fund massive export subsidies amounting to an estimated \$16 billion in 1986 and 1988 in order to fund the necessary exports to keep our production at the level that the gentleman's amendment provided. Even if approved, the international ramifications of export subsidies on this scale would undercut both Congress and the administration's argument for fair trade. Coupled with the fact that if such a subsidy became a major factor opening a trade war, which I think will happen, one of the first and largest sectors to suffer would be agriculture.

Some supporters of this legislation argue that farmers have a right to choose their own price support program, and I submit there is nothing wrong with that. The question is what we are voting for? If a vote needs to be taken, it should be our responsibility as drafters of public policy to develop and provide sound and equitable legislation through proper means instead of bowing to last-minute orchestrations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] has expired.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would say to my dear friend on the Agriculture Committee that we are trying to get to a vote. We have to rise at 6:30. I wonder if the gentleman could make it brief?

Mr. STENHOLM. I will do it in 1 minute.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. STENHOLM. If we are to change our agriculture policy as dramatically as this amendment suggests, we should allow our farmers to vote to do it. We should have taken more than 5 minutes in the Agriculture Committee in perfecting and debating and making this amendment workable. We should have taken more than 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, let me say that I think most of us know that mandatory controls are not the way to go. I think most of us know that mandatory controls are sort of like what Will Rogers said about Prohibition: "It may sound good, but it just will not work."

To those of us on the committee, witness what has happened in tobacco and peanut programs as we have had to make them more workable in the modern world before you ask to do to wheat and corn and feed grains what we will be asked to do should the motion to strike the Bedell amendment not carry.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the referendum process is one of the most devastating, absolutely the most devastating concept that has been offered to agricultural programs since I have been in Congress or since I can remember.

Would the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADIGAN], answer a question for me?

How much reduction did the gentleman say would be required to meet the requirements of the bill?

I yield to the gentleman for his response.

Mr. MADIGAN. I would say to the gentleman that in the 1986 crop year, the Bedell proposal calls for a 30-percent set-aside on wheat, a 20-percent set-aside on corn, and then as a provision that in the years 1987 to 1990 the Secretary will set the set-aside determined by what the carryover crop is. There are levels provided for in the referendum as to what triggers lower or higher set-asides.

The United States Department of Agriculture says in the second year, the set-aside on wheat would be 50 percent of the acres, and on corn it would be 40 percent of the acres.

Mr. MARLENEE. Fifty percent of our wheat would be set aside into a nonuse or it could not be put into corn or other crops?

Mr. MADIGAN. That is the statement provided to the committee by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MARLENEE. It seems to me that when this Nation takes one of its most productive industries and cuts its output by 50 percent, by 50 percent, we are dealing a devastating blow to our balance of payments in this country. Devastating.

If we cut our exports by what this bill purports to do, and we cut our production by 50 percent, think of the effect that this will have on the country, think of the effect that this will have on our local and rural communities. How many fewer tractors we will sell; how much less fertilizer; how many fewer businessmen and services will be offered in the small towns which are already empty up and down main street. We have a lot of empty buildings up and down these main streets in these small towns, and I would urge my colleagues to think about those long and hard before they vote for the amendment or this propo-



sition where we have a referendum that would further exacerbate the situation.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARLENEE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to raise a problem that I have discovered where we have had an amendment adopted here just a few minutes that was not eligible for consideration under the rule. It is my understanding that the Bedell amendment that was adopted to this section a few minutes ago had not been printed in the RECORD in a timely fashion, so under the rule, it was not eligible for consideration on the floor except by unanimous consent.

In fact, we did not have a unanimous-consent request for that amendment, so therefore it should not have been considered under the regular procedures. Given that situation, it seems to me that the House should not be acting upon an amendment at this point that is based upon perfecting language that was offered that was not in fact eligible for consideration on the House floor.

If I might, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings be vacated under the Bedell amendment adopted to this section was adopted.

□ 1830

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MARLENEE].

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, if I may continue, if the producers of this country have told the agriculture Representatives in Congress one thing, it has been that "We want a long-term program that we can depend on, one that we can make projections with." They do not want to come back with a referendum every year to see what kind of a program they are going to have the next year. They do not want to have the uncertainty.

They want to have a program they can rely on, one they can sit down with their banker with, so they can decide how much fertilizer they need in the next year, how much financing they need in the next 5 years, whether they are going to buy land, whether they are going to sell land, or, as a matter of fact, whether they are going to stay in business. A referendum process absolutely does not contribute to that kind of stability in the agricultural communities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MARLENEE] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MARLENEE was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, finally, let us think what this kind of a proposition does. Let us think what these referendum propositions do to our reputation as a reliable supplier. It completely destroys our ability to build our image as a reliable supplier. We would be saying:

Yes, we will have this program unless we have a referendum, and then we will have something else, but if the farmers turn it down, then we will have some other kind of a program.

It completely destroys our ability to project the image of a reliable supplier.

Finally, the referendum process is not supported by the National Wheat Growers, by the Farm Bureau, or by responsible farm organizations. I would ask the Members to support the Madigan amendment and vote against the referendum process.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. BARNES] having assumed the chair, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2100) to extend and revise agricultural price support and related programs, to provide for agricultural export, resource conservation, farm credit, and agricultural research and related programs, to continue food assistance to low-income persons, to ensure consumers an abundance of food and fiber at reasonable prices, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. LOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time for the purpose of inquiring as to the schedule for the balance of the day and for the week, and I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority whip because, as I understand it, there have been some changes made in the schedule for the balance of the day and for the remainder of the week.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished Republican whip for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we intend to take up under suspension of the rules this evening a bill, H.R. 3453, providing for an extension of the Superfund for 45 days, and following the consideration

of that suspension the House will have concluded its business for today.

Tomorrow, the House will meet at 11 o'clock to consider the appropriation legislation for Health and Human Services for fiscal year 1986, and following that we will resume consideration of the agriculture bill. We will rise at 6 o'clock tomorrow night.

We will then continue to consider the agriculture bill on Thursday, hoping to complete consideration of the bill by Thursday evening. I would caution Members that it is our intention to attempt to conclude the bill Thursday night, and there may be a late session on Thursday for that purpose.

If we conclude the agriculture bill on Thursday night, we do not plan to schedule business for Friday. In the event that we do not complete the agriculture bill on Thursday night, a Friday session can be anticipated.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, if the whip would allow me to intervene at that point while he is looking down at his schedule, I think we should emphasize again to our Members that the intention is to bring the agriculture bill back up for consideration tomorrow after we complete the Labor-HHS appropriation bill, or, if we do not have any more time left tomorrow, the agriculture bill will be brought back up on Thursday, and the intention of the leadership is to complete consideration of the agriculture bill this week, is that correct? Whether it is Thursday night or Friday, the intention of the leadership is to complete the agriculture bill this week?

Mr. FOLEY. Yes, we intend to complete consideration of the agriculture bill Thursday night and, if necessary, to go late Thursday night for that purpose. If we do complete consideration of that bill on Thursday, as I have indicated, we do not intend to schedule business on Friday.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, there were some other pieces of legislation on the schedule for this week, but they will be taken up at a later time, and I assume the Members will be notified of that; is that correct?

Mr. FOLEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on today's consideration of H.R. 2100.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

# **SUPERFUND EXCISE TAX EXTENSION**

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3453) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the Superfund taxes for 45 days.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3453

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

## **SECTION 1. 45-DAY EXTENSION OF SUPERFUND TAXES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (d) of section 4611 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to termination of environmental taxes) is amended by striking out "September 30, 1985" and inserting in lieu thereof "November 14, 1985".

### **(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—**

(1) Subparagraph (D) of section 223(c)(2) of the Hazardous Substance Response Revenue Act of 1980 is amended by striking out "September 30, 1985" and inserting in lieu thereof "November 14, 1985".

(2) Section 303 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 is amended by striking out "September 30, 1985" and inserting in lieu thereof "November 14, 1985".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on September 30, 1985.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI].

### **GENERAL LEAVE**

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3453, the bill presently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3453 provides a short 45-day extension of the Superfund taxes the Congress enacted in 1980. The funding mechanism for the important Superfund Hazardous Waste Cleanup Program expired last night.

A short extension now is important so that the Congress can act in a deliberative manner to enact the 5-year reauthorization of Superfund without any loss of revenues to the trust fund

during the debate. At a time when the EPA is severely reducing its cleanup efforts, we cannot afford to lose any money which we can collect.

Let me emphasize that this extension is only for 45 days so that the existing tax collecting mechanisms can continue in place. It is not a long-term extension into the next Congress. I would oppose a long politically motivated extension.

The Senate has already passed legislation to reauthorize the program and to expand the taxes associated with it. The House will soon consider similar legislation. It is probable that any legislation that is enacted will continue these original taxes at their preexisting rates or higher rates.

In the interest of avoiding an unwarranted disruption, I urge approval of H.R. 3453.

□ 1840

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I support the bill, H.R. 3453.

I do so with some reluctance, however. I had hoped that our committee would be able to deal with Superfund legislation in a comprehensive way before today. Unfortunately, other committees of jurisdiction have not completed their work, and we had planned to take up the tax aspects of Superfund after the other committees had made their decisions on program changes.

In light of these timing problems, the termination of Superfund taxes at the end of the fiscal year—which was midnight—and difficulties with respect to getting our committee's deficit reduction bill to the floor, I think it would be wise to grant the additional 45 days in which to find workable resolutions.

I can assure my colleagues I will do everything I can to make certain that our committee does, indeed, deal promptly and comprehensively with Superfund legislation should the 45-day extension be approved by the Congress and signed by the President. If the bill before us today does not become law, I am frankly concerned that this might pave the way for both confusion and mischief. The Committee on Ways and Means, in seeking the extension, is not stalling; we want, instead, to buy some time to take responsible and expeditious action.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI].

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Illinois for his leadership in the fight to renew the Superfund to clean up hazardous waste sites. As the gentleman is aware, my district includes the Butler Tunnel, an abandoned mine shaft, an illegal dump site in Pittston Township in Pennsyl-

vania, which is one of only six toxic waste sites in the Nation to be declared clean by the EPA. Despite EPA's assurances in 1982 that the Butler Tunnel site was clean, last weekend's hurricane caused over 100,000 gallons of highly toxic waste to be discharged into the Susquehanna River, creating a 60-mile oil slick and threatening water quality all the way down the river to the Chesapeake Bay.

The EPA has already alerted communities as far south as Baltimore to be aware of the threat the discharge poses.

The Center for Disease Control in Atlanta urges area residents not to come in contact with the spill, which contains substances which can cause damage to the skin, respiratory tract, and gastrointestinal system problems.

Mr. Speaker, it is essential that this extension legislation be passed today so that projects like this, emergency projects caused during disaster times, can be undertaken with sufficient funding and sufficient activity by the EPA to act immediately.

We are talking here of the water quality that serves literally millions of Americans that has been put in jeopardy. I urge my colleagues in the House to support the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois by supporting this legislation.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the minority whip, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT].

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I really question the need for this 45-day extension. I think the Members would like very much to get action on Superfund legislation, and that is my point. I would like for us to keep the pressure on and get this legislation to the floor as soon as possible.

Now, I realize that we have got three different committees at least involved here and that they all have actions that they are working on; but I would like to get some understanding that we are not going to see this thing dragged out again and again. We do not need 45 days. I do not see why we need even 20 days.

I would like to ask the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, do we have some understanding that this thing is going to move forward expeditiously and that it will be brought up to the floor for consideration sometime in this month?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. I think there was an agreement with the leadership this afternoon that the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on the Judiciary are going to act quickly on this legislation. I believe the Committee on Energy and



Commerce has already reported the legislation.

Immediately after the legislation is reported from the Public Works Committee and the Judiciary Committee, the Ways and Means Committee will consider the legislation. I am sure that the Committee on Ways and Means will be as expeditious as possible.

I am afraid that we on the Committee on Ways and Means want to see what the programming needs are before we fund them.

Mr. LOTT. Well, maybe I could address a question to members of the Public Works Committee, the chairman of the committee perhaps or the subcommittee could give us some information when the Committee on Public Works might report. Could we expect something within the next 10 days?

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOTT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, Chairman HOWARD of the Public Works Committee has sent out a formal notice now from the Public Works Committee, with the ranking member, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER] that we will schedule to mark up the bill on Wednesday of next week in the subcommittee and Thursday in the full committee; so 95 percent of the work of the Committee on Public Works is completed. We will mark up the bill, that is the direction, next week, both in the subcommittee and in the full committee and report out the bill.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I wonder if maybe the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce that has already acted would express himself on it. That committee has already taken action and I worry that 45 days is quite a delay.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] has expired.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOTT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I will try to respond briefly.

I was present in the meeting referred to. Our committee has already acted on this legislation. We are anxious to see it move.

My personal feeling is that 45 days are not needed, but I am willing to go along with it as long as it does not become an obstacle.

Mr. LOTT. Does the gentleman feel that he has a commitment that it will move quickly out of the Public Works

Committee and through the Rules Committee and to the floor?

Mr. DINGELL. Well, the distinguished chairman of both the subcommittee and the full Committee on Public Works, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE] have indicated that it is their intention to have the bill out of their committees by a week from this next Friday.

The Judiciary Committee has indicated that they can meet approximately the same time limit and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has acted this morning.

The Speaker has indicated that it is his intention to move this legislation as speedily as he knows how, so it is my hope that the matter can move speedily.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] of course, can speak for himself and for the Ways and Means Committee and will have to do so, as I am not empowered to do so.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

I would like to have some more specific commitment about when we can expect it in the Rules Committee and on the floor, but I recognize that we are dealing with several different committees and that is hard to do.

This is important legislation. I know the Members on both sides of the aisle have worked very hard on this in different committees and would like to see this legislation brought to the House for full consideration.

I would urge all the committees, all persons involved in the various committees, to get it to the Congress this month.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] for making this time available to me and I commend the gentleman for his comments made.

I share some of the concerns just raised by the distinguished minority whip, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT]. I do have reservation about taking this course, but I am willing to support the bill, in reliance on the pronouncements of the Speaker and others that this matter will go forward.

There is \$130 million available at this time in the Superfund and there is not a desperate need for this extension. There is a sufficiency of moneys available according to the Administrator of the EPA that the process down there at EPA can go forward without any significant impairment during the time of the next 30 to 45 days.

Indeed, the spokesman for the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection said yesterday that the gap would not hurt the program. He said as follows:

"We anticipate no interruptions. We already have \$150 million appropriated and we are ready for it."

Similar comments have been made, as I mentioned, by the Administrator of the EPA.

The Governor of the State of Michigan has expressed particular concerns about the possibility of not enacting Superfund legislation during this year.

With this country having literally thousands, indeed, I have heard the figure of 100,000 Superfund sites which now are in need of cleanup, there is need for the most urgent speed, because this may perhaps be the largest single environmental and health problem now confronting the American people.

It should be noted that the Senate has passed a Superfund bill and for the House to delay further enactment of legislation of this kind would be indeed an action in which we could be charged with disregarding the public interest and in failing to carry forward on a matter of extreme and urgent importance.

As I mentioned, several committees having jurisdiction have met with the Speaker and all, including the Speaker, have agreed that the matter will move as expeditiously as possible. That is a judgment in which I concur and in reliance on those statements and in reliance on the urgent need to go forward with the least controversy, I am willing to support this legislation, even though I am aware that it is probably less than completely necessary.

I thank my dear friend, the gentleman from Illinois, for yielding to me.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LENT].

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great reluctance that I rise to note my concern about a 45-day extension of the Superfund. I believe that the reauthorization of the Superfund is the most critical environmental program we will enact in this Congress. I am well aware that the taxing authority for Superfund ran out last night. I am concerned, however, that a 45-day extension will provide an easy out for those who for whatever reason are not able or are unwilling to face the important task of reauthorizing the Superfund now.

The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency put the cleanup program on hold in September due to uncertainty over funding.

We must not be lulled into thinking that a 45-day extension will allow the EPA to continue its full cleanup activities.

A simple extension such as we are considering here tonight will provide only one-third of the moneys the EPA was expecting to have for fiscal year 1986. This lack of money, coupled with uncertainties about when the full funding might be put in place, will continue to cripple the Superfund cleanup program.

So rather than talk about a 45-day extension, we ought to be considering how much time is actually needed for us to reauthorize Superfund.

I know that the other body has sent us a reauthorization bill for our consideration in a timely manner. We heard from the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee that H.R. 2817 was reported 2 months ago. The Merchant Marine Committee to which this bill was referred reported H.R. 2817 today with only one negative vote. The Administrative Law Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee marked up H.R. 2817 on September 11, and we hear that the full committee will mark up the bill next Tuesday. We learn from the press reports that the Ways and Means Committee is ready to mark up the bill, and the chairman of that committee has been quoted as saying it is simply a 1-day job. The chairman of the Committee on Public Works will report its Superfund bill to the House some time next week.

So it would seem to me all this being said that if all of the committees with jurisdiction are able to meet these commitments on this important subject, a subject considered at length in the last Congress, we could have Superfund reauthorized in a much shorter term than 45 days.

I would hope that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI], the sponsor of this legislation, might consider amending this legislation to extend the funding for 15 or perhaps 18 days so that we will not mask the urgency of the need to reauthorize, expand, and improve the Superfund Program.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ECKERT].

Mr. ECKERT of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise in opposition to the 45-day extension of Superfund. Such an extension will serve only to mask the critical problem facing our country, the cleanup of our hazardous waste dump sites. While a 45-day fund extension may have some surface appeal, it does not move the cleanup program forward.

As my colleague from New York mentioned, in September the Administrator of the EPA stopped work at 57 sites due to the uncertainty of the re-

authorization of Superfund. The work that would have been undertaken in September was based on the expectation of an increase of funding by threefold. A simple 45-day extension will leave the funding two-thirds short.

Therefore, this 45-day extension will not enable additional cleanup to go forward in the proper manner.

I note as others have that the other body has concluded its work on this important legislation. I am embarrassed to tell my colleagues back home that I have not yet had the opportunity to vote on Superfund on the floor of this House despite the fact that the committee on which I serve, the Energy and Commerce Committee, produced a carefully crafted bipartisan compromise measure by an overwhelming margin of 31 to 10.

We must spend our time working on permanent solutions to the Superfund, and I do not think we can tolerate any further delay.

I would hope that the commitments implied here tonight are honored and that we do not go beyond that 45 days, because even that is far too long.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, except that I would like to yield myself about 15 seconds to say in colloquy with the gentleman from New York that it certainly should not be necessary that any further extension be taken, that we do complete our work in 45 days. I personally would not favor any additional extension and I would hope that the chairman of our committee would agree with that.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I certainly expect immediately after the Committee on Ways and Means receives documents from the other various committees we will work on it and get it done hopefully within a week.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to voice my support of this temporary extension of current Superfund legislation. Congress needs sufficient time to pass a tough and comprehensive Superfund bill. At this time I want to reiterate my objections to the Superfund legislation passed by the Energy and Commerce Committee. I feel this extension will allow me and my colleagues on other committees to pass a comprehensive Superfund bill. I have always been a strong supporter of Superfund, but we must make every effort to work to ensure that the bill that we finally pass is strong and effective and one that achieves the goal of cleaning up the worst hazardous waste sites on a thorough and expedited schedule.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time,

and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Speaker, Congress has again forced itself into action. Faced with a deadline for reauthorizing Superfund, the Congress dragged its feet for 9 full months and has acted now to merely extend the Superfund for 45 days.

As a member of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, one of the committee which has jurisdiction over the authorization of the Superfund, I am personally outraged by the necessity of this action. From the very first day of the 99th Congress, every Member in this body knew that we had a job to do. Every Member knew just how big that job was, and just how quickly we had to do it. In spite of this knowledge, the clock ran out on Superfund and, typically, we found ourselves in a position to have to take a Band-Aid approach to yet one more problem.

It almost seems like the bigger our problems are, the more willing this body is to use a Band-Aid approach to solve the problem. The debt ceiling, the budget, Superfund, these are all issues that deserve better solutions than his Congress has been willing to deliver.

I know that many of my colleagues have worked very hard for timely Superfund reauthorization. I have worked with members of my own committee and members of many of the other committees with jurisdiction over Superfund to see that we got our job done on time. I have joined with my own committee chairman and subcommittee chairman, and with the ranking members of the Public Works and Transportation Committee and the Subcommittee on Water Resources, in a complete commitment to accomplish a thorough and adequate reauthorization for the Superfund.

I am not sure that the commitment that we have made is pervasive throughout Congress, and I am very concerned that our temporary Band-Aid extension of Superfund might have taken the pressure off of those Members who do not share our commitment to protecting our environment.

In spite of the lack of progress that we, as a body, have made in the last 9 months, 45 days is more than enough time to accomplish an adequate reauthorization of the most important environmental program in our country, provided that we all dedicate ourselves to getting the job done. Without this dedication, there is not enough time.

Today I would like to take this opportunity to call upon all of the Members of this body, from all the States and from both parties to join in our commitment to do this job. To reauthorize Superfund, to do it right, and to do it now. Any further Band-Aid approaches are just not acceptable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3453.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof)



the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**PROHIBITION OF THE IMPORTATION OF THE SOUTH AFRICAN KRUGERRAND—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 99-114)**

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Tuesday, October 1, 1985.)

**EXTENDING GOVERNING INTERNATIONAL FISHERY AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 99-113)**

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and ordered to be printed.

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Tuesday, October 1, 1985.)

□ 1900

**RETIREMENT OF HON. PARREN MITCHELL**

(Mr. BARNES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, it is with both sadness and a sense of respect for his decision that I note the decision of our distinguished colleague and friend from my own State of Maryland, the great Congressman from Baltimore City, PARREN MITCHELL, to retire at the end of this term.

When PARREN MITCHELL leaves this Chamber after his last day as a Member of the House of Representatives, the Congress of the United States is going to lose one of its great champions for the dignity of the downtrodden, one of the great champions for civil liberties, for civil rights, and really, I think all of my colleagues would agree, a conscience that has spoken so beautifully and so eloquently over so many years here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, we will lose one of the great Members of the U.S. Congress with PARREN MITCHELL's retirement. The Maryland delegation will lose its distinguished dean, and I will lose the daily occasion to work with a great friend and colleague, and it is with sadness that I note his decision to leave the House of Representatives.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNES. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GEKAS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I will take only a few seconds for the purpose of associating myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Maryland.

Although I do not come from Maryland, I, too, will miss the eloquence of PARREN MITCHELL.

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, one of our greatest colleagues has decided to retire, which I noted, as I say, with sadness.

**HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE FOR UNITA FORCES IN ANGOLA**

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, today I'd like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the situation in Communist-controlled Angola—where a group of freedom fighters known as the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola [UNITA] are fighting to liberate the people of their country from the despotical grip of a government which was installed and is controlled by Cuban military forces under the direction of the Soviet Union—and a bill I am introducing today that would provide for a measure of humanitarian assistance to the UNITA forces.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House are well aware of the deprivation of freedom being imposed on the people of Angola by the Soviet-backed Cubans. In 1976, Congress took the step of enacting the so-called Clark amendment which prohibited the use of American foreign aid to assist any military or paramilitary forces operating in Angola. Since that ill-conceived action was taken, over 200,000 Cuban military personnel have been sent to that nation to maintain forcefully in power the illegitimate government which they installed in 1975.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues demonstrated their growing awareness that freedom is being cynically and barbarically denied to the people of Angola when they voted on July 10 of this year—by a 51-vote margin—to repeal the Clark amendment. Now, for the first time in 10 years, the United States is free to take a stand in favor of the principle tenets which we have

always held to be the right of every man and woman—basic liberties which for too long have been denied to the people of Angola.

The tradition of the United States of helping people all over the world who are oppressed is an honored tradition steeped in the best intentions of a nation which shed the yoke of tyranny and has preserved its right to choose freedom for over 200 years. When we turned our eyes away from the cynical deprivation of freedom inflicted on the people of Angola in 1975—a condition which persists to this very day—we abandoned our own links with the never-ending struggle for liberty. The greatest freedom-loving nation in the world left the Communist forces free and unfettered adventuristically to extend their influence among the peoples of southern Africa. Nevertheless, the forces of UNITA maintained the fight on behalf of the Angolan people, and continue to resist the Cuban occupation against odds made great by an unwavering commitment on the part of the Soviet Union to take southern Africa for its own.

Having repealed the Clark amendment, the next logical—and essential—step for this Congress to take is to send the message to the freedom fighters of the UNITA movement that the United States is deeply sympathetic and willing to help in the effort to restore justice and democracy in Angola by extending to them humanitarian aid: That the people of the greatest, strongest, and most enduring freedom-loving nation in the world have not let the oppression imposed by the advocates of world communism go unnoticed. We must join our voices as well as our resources with those of the people of the world who recognize that Soviet hegemony in vulnerable nations is, in fact, the greatest threat to peace which the world faces today.

The bill I am introducing would pave the way for the Congress to make available the humanitarian support which the fighters for freedom in Angola so desperately need today by authorizing \$27 million for that purpose. Its passage would permit the United States to make available to the UNITA forces the food, clothing, and medicine that they will need to carry on their fight. Perhaps just as importantly, the assistance which we make available will provide a boost to the morale of a force that is faced with a fight against all the resources and all of the will to conquer which are available to the Soviets and their Cuban benefactors.

I would point out to my colleagues that the bill I introduce today would not allow the use of funds authorized for the provision of weapons, ammunition, and other equipment, vehicles, or materiel which could be used to inflict serious bodily harm or death. The bill

would also prohibit the administration of the assistance by either the Central Intelligence Agency or the Department of Defense.

The language I have employed in the bill submitted to the House today is substantially similar to the provisions of the McDade amendment to the supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1985 which the House agreed to on June 12 of this year. That amendment made \$27 million available in humanitarian aid to the Contras fighting for freedom in Nicaragua—an amount which will allow them to win the fight against famine and illness so that they can carry on the fight against tyranny.

Now that the Clark amendment has been repealed, we have the opportunity to make the same commitment to the people of Angola—\$27 million for humanitarian aid so that the advocates of democracy in southern Africa may not be defeated by want for basic needs.

Mr. Speaker, it is essential that we extend the commitment shown for democracy in Nicaragua by adopting the McDade amendment, and in Angola by repealing the Clark amendment, by taking positive action to assist Angolan freedom fighters. The bill I present to the House would authorize the enactment of appropriations so that such assistance may become available during the fiscal year which began today.

I urge my colleagues to consider carefully the dire conditions in Angola today, to recognize the deprivations of freedom which have been imposed by the presence of over 200,000 Cuban troops over the past 10 years, to recognize that that presence represents the continuing strategy of Soviet communism to extend its influence in nations which do not have adequate resources with which to resist their awesome military might, and to at last make a statement to the world—and especially to the people of Angola—that the greatest nation in the world does not intend to stand passively by while Cuba and the Soviet Union use force to extend their sphere of influence in the world.

#### TRIBUTE TO HON. MARGARET HECKLER, SECRETARY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

(Mr. SCHEUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay great tribute to our distinguished former colleague, the Honorable Margaret M. Heckler, who earlier today announced her resignation as Secretary of Health and Human Services under apparent pressure from White House staff.

Although Mrs. Heckler has agreed to serve as Ambassador to Ireland, a post in which I am sure she will serve with distinction, it is regrettable that this tireless public servant was forced to make her decision as the result of harsh and unjustified criticism voiced by unnamed administration officials.

While some of us may have disagreed with Mrs. Heckler on occasion, I think all of us can appreciate the enormous challenge of managing a department as large as Health and Human Services, a department with an annual budget in excess of \$325 billion and one which directly affects the lives of all Americans.

The same faceless officials who criticized Mrs. Heckler's management style also failed to point out that more than a half dozen top posts at HHS remain unfilled because the White House was, in the words of Larry Speakes, "looking for the right people."

What a bum rap!

Despite the well-documented cases of waste, fraud, and abuse in Pentagon procurement programs, I find it curious that we have not heard any calls from White House staffers for the resignation of Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger.

In her capacity as Secretary of HHS, Mrs. Heckler often found herself in the awkward position of arguing for more Federal spending as a member of an administration intent on cutting Federal spending, regardless of the human and social costs.

Mrs. Heckler fought officials at OMB and the White House in her far-sighted advocacy for increased funding for research into national health problems such as Alzheimer's disease and the AIDS epidemic.

One has to wonder if this was a factor in what is widely perceived as her ouster from the Cabinet?

One has to wonder if a male member of the Cabinet would have been subjected to a similar campaign of discredit and innuendo by anonymous White House bureaucrats?

I, for one, wish her the very best of luck in her new post.

#### TIME FOR FARMERS TO VOTE ON AMERICAN FARM POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, it is time for farmers to vote on the direction of American farm policy.

Farmers have debated the pros and cons of mandatory versus voluntary farm programs for more than 30 years.

I believe farmers have a fundamental right to decide what direction they want to go—providing the choices are within the budget limitations when farmers make this basic choice it will

hopefully end this debate for years to come.

I wonder why the Secretary of Agriculture says the President will veto any farm bill that contains a referendum?

Could it be that he doesn't want a good debate in farm country about agricultural policy because this debate will clearly reveal how detrimental this administration's fiscal policy has been to agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, during this debate, farmers will see clearly that reducing the deficit is crucial to agriculture.

During this debate, farmers will see clearly that protectionism is self-destructive.

Farmers know the effect of an overvalued dollar in limiting exports. They know what record high interest rates mean and they know what roller-coaster acreage reduction programs mean.

I will support the Bedell provisions in order to provide them that opportunity.

It is within the limits of the budget.

Some may fear a debate in farm country.

I do not.

I welcome it and I encourage my colleagues to support the Bedell provisions of the farm bill.

#### TAX TREATMENT OF DIVORCING SPOUSES IN COMMUNITY PROPERTY STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Louisiana [Mrs. BOGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation to provide for the equitable tax treatment of individuals subject to a divorce decree which retroactively terminates their marriage community. This legislation is the result of an inequity that was brought to my attention by an attorney in Louisiana.

In a typical divorce, the husband continues to be employed, earning an income; the wife either is not employed or is making less money than the husband. At present, the wife continues to be personally liable for the income tax due on one-half of her husband's earnings during the divorce or separation proceedings despite the fact that she does not receive a portion of such income.

The Internal Revenue Service does not recognize the termination of the marriage community of divorcing spouses in Louisiana and some other States until a final judgment of separation or divorce is rendered. In Revenue Ruling 74-393, the Service stated that a Louisiana judgment of separation or divorce, which dissolves the community retroactively to the date of filing of the petition for divorce or separation under State law, has no retroactive effect on the existence of the community for Federal income tax purposes. This



causes a great inequity to the lower income generating spouse and a windfall to the high-income spouse.

I do not know how widespread this particular problem might be. Since it does affect the tax liability of divorcing spouses in Louisiana, I believe it merits review by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker, the text of H.R. 3458 follows:

H.R. 3458

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 66 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to treatment of community income) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:*

*"(e) TREATMENT OF RETROACTIVE TERMINATION OF COMMUNITY.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, in the case of an individual legally separated from his spouse under a decree of divorce or separate maintenance which terminates the community (under applicable community property laws) as of a date earlier than the date on which the decree is granted, any item of income earned by the individual on or after the date on which the community was terminated (under applicable community property laws) shall be included in the gross income of the individual (and not in the gross income of the spouse), if the spouse—*

*"(1) did not receive an interest in the item of income under the decree; and*

*"(2) did not exercise control over the item of income earned by the individual on or after the date on which the community was terminated (under applicable community property laws).*

*This subsection does not apply to any amount which is includible in the income of a spouse under section 71 (relating to alimony and separate maintenance payments)."*

*(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to communities terminated by a decree of divorce or separate maintenance granted on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.*

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, on September 26, 1985, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote No. 288 on Senate Joint Resolution 27.

Had I been present, I would have concurred with the resolution.

#### LET TRUE INDEPENDENCE REIGN IN CYPRUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, today is the anniversary making a quarter of a century of independence for the Republic of Cyprus. On such a day, the people of that nation should be able to reflect on the progress of their freedom, the hope of their independence, and the growth of their culture as they make firm their grasp on the promise of the Free World. I called this special order because that celebration is denied our friends in the Republic of Cyprus, and will be denied them as long as their land remains divided by bitter differences perpetuated by military forces.

The rift between Greek and Turkish Cypriots was formalized by the violent invasion of Turkish troops over a decade ago; 200,000 Greek Cypriots were forced from their homes. Today, Cyprus remains divided, the island in turmoil. More than 30,000 Turkish troops continue to occupy the island. Tens of thousands of Turkish colonists were lured from the mainland to settle the occupied territory. And the Government in Ankara continues to subsidize half of the Turkish Cypriot budget.

These divisive actions have been taken despite an increasingly generous program of United States foreign aid to Turkey. Since our aid embargo was lifted in 1978, we have sent nearly \$4 billion to Turkey, making it our third largest foreign aid recipient. All of this assistance has been provided under the clearly expressed condition that Turkey cooperate fully in the efforts to bring about a solution on Cyprus.

Yet cooperation has hardly been forthcoming. In 1983, Turkey alone supported the declaration of an independent Turkish federated state on Cyprus. As a direct result of this action and the continued illegal presence of Turkish troops on the island, the Congress last year cut military assistance to Turkey and conditioned \$215 million in military grant aid upon Turkey's good faith progress in intercommunal talks on the reunification of Cyprus, particularly with respect to the treatment of the city of Famagusta, a major urban center which is held by the occupying Turkish troops.

This year, hope has been raised by the efforts of U.N. Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar. After long years of frustration over the absence of progress on negotiations, the first summit meeting last January between President Kyprianou and Rauf Denktash was a significant and welcome development, providing the first real hope for peace in the divided nation.

Congress has fortified this hope this year by authorizing again a special \$250 million fund for Cyprus contingent on a successfully negotiated settlement. The peace and reconstruction fund, it was hoped, will help focus constructive energy on ways of encourag-

ing the parties on Cyprus to work out their differences, and remove the obstacles to peace.

Indeed, such a settlement has taken another step forward. After an inconclusive first meeting, President Kyprianou, with the support of Javier Perez de Cuellar, has drafted and signed a fresh agreement. On reporting this development to Congress, President Reagan quotes Mr. Perez de Cuellar saying, "provided both sides manifest the necessary good will and cooperation, an agreement can be reached without further delay." The President's statement follows:

TEXT OF A LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT TO THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND THE CHAIRMAN OF THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, SEPTEMBER 3, 1985

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In accordance with Public Law 95-384, I am submitting herewith a bimonthly report on progress toward a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus question.

Since my previous report, United Nations Secretary General Perez de Cuellar has continued his efforts, begun last fall, to obtain the two Cypriot communities' acceptance of an agreement containing the elements of a comprehensive Cyprus settlement. He endeavored to overcome the difficulties that had arisen during the January 1985 summit meeting by incorporating components of the documentation into a consolidated draft agreement. His expressed intention was to bring greater clarity to its various elements and to devise procedural arrangements for follow-up action, while preserving the substance of the documentation. The Secretary General reported to the Security Council in June, a copy of which is attached, that the Greek Cypriot side had replied affirmatively to his revised documentation and that he was awaiting the Turkish Cypriot response to his efforts. The Secretary General added that, "provided both sides manifest the necessary goodwill and co-operation, an agreement can be reached without further delay."

The Turkish Cypriots postponed replying to the Secretary General while they proceeded with a constitutional referendum on May 5, a presidential election on June 9, and parliamentary elections on June 23. The Turkish Cypriots stated that the referendum and elections would not preclude their participation in a federal Cypriot state. We have repeatedly registered with both communities our conviction that actions which might impede the Secretary General's efforts to negotiate an agreement should be avoided and have reiterated our policy of not recognizing a separate Turkish Cypriot "state."

Since my last report to you, American officials in Cyprus have met regularly with leaders of both Cypriot communities. Department of State Special Cyprus Coordinator Richard Haass visited Cyprus, Greece, and Turkey in July. He discussed the Cyprus issue with the two Cypriot parties and the Governments of Greece and Turkey and expressed our support for the Secretary General's initiative. We continue to urge flexibility by all parties and are encouraged that they continue to support a negotiated

settlement under the Secretary General's good offices mandate.

Sincerely,

RONALD REAGAN.

But Mr. Speaker, we have not seen the goodwill of Mr. Denktash. The Turkish Cypriots delayed responding to this agreement while they held a presidential election on June 9 of this year, followed by parliamentary elections later that month. Such an approach served only to further divide the two sides, and provided an inauspicious example of the sort of cooperation to come. In August, Mr. Denktash rejected the new document, declaring it impossible to accept the withdrawal of Turkish troops, and stating that Turkish Cypriots would not live in an integrated society with their Greek counterparts.

Cypriots cannot wait any longer for the freedom that they won 25 years ago, and neither should they have to. So much is at stake: The strength of NATO's southern flank is undermined by the continued tensions between Greece and Turkey over Cyprus; the United States continues to fund substantially a country that maintains an illegal occupying force on allied land. Finally, of course, is the right of Cyprus to govern itself, free from external threat.

Cyprus has been a good friend of the United States. Its people gave us crucial assistance in treating our wounded from the catastrophic bombing of our Marine barracks in Lebanon. President Kyprianou has led a tireless struggle against drug trafficking which is rife in that region of the world. Most recently, in standing on principle in support of a settlement, he repudiated the Communist Party on Cyprus—a brave move that could cost him dearly. President Kyprianou has earned our friendship, and our support. We can do more to demonstrate that commitment.

President Reagan met with Turkish Prime Minister Ozal in April, but could not make time in his schedule to meet with President Kyprianou. Such an invitation would clearly demonstrate the willingness of the United States to be a facilitator in the continuing negotiations to bring peace and unity back to Cyprus.

In Congress, unfortunate tensions with the leadership in Greece have sparked a reluctance to deal strongly with Turkey on the issue of Cyprus. The United States should never be loath to ask cooperation from a country receiving substantial military and economic aid, and we must continue to make clear to the Government of Turkey that its support of the occupation of Cyprus, and its refusal to withdraw its troops is unacceptable. When an American aid recipient uses the aid to force itself upon a neighbor, we are inescapably involved.

□ 1910

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will my colleague yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding. Let me in the beginning express my deep appreciation to my colleague for making the effort to hold this special order today on the 25th anniversary of the independence of Cyprus.

Shortly after I was elected to Congress, serving in January 1969, I had the opportunity to visit Cyprus, at the behest of people from my own community who are very interested in this very difficult problem. It is clear upon visiting Cyprus that if there is an illustration of the contrast between freedom and authoritarian systems, one can see it in that small island. The industry, the spirit, the attitude, indeed the warmth of the free Cypriot people pervades that atmosphere. Simply cross the line and you see the stark contrast of authoritarianism at work.

It seems to me that it is important to the Congress to focus itself once again on this critical problem. It is clear that early on, as the invasion had taken place, that the Congress did react with our embargo. We expressed our deep concern and our opposition to the Turkish action.

Since that time, however, our administrations have been less than straightforward in terms of what our policy in a moral sense ought to be.

This question, as my colleague knows, is not a partisan question. It is perhaps a reflection of our State Department's inability to act with consistency and with a sort of thinking that is long range and reflects a commitment to freedom.

It is very, very important that those of us who care about those fundamental principles, continue from time to time, when it is appropriate, to raise this flag, to express our concern. The gentleman doing this special order on this anniversary date is most important. I want to express my appreciation once again.

Today, October 1, the Republic of Cyprus is celebrating its 25th anniversary of independence. Unfortunately, during this day of celebration, we realize that the people of Cyprus are not completely independent. Their country remains divided and occupied by more than 30,000 Turkish troops.

Out special thanks and appreciation goes to U.N. Secretary General Perez de Cuellar for his willingness and efforts to arrange the January summit meetings between Cyprus President Kyprianou and Mr. Rauf Denktash. Prior to this summit, expectation levels were high. It seems that for the first time since the 1974 invasion of Turkish troops there were expressions of goodwill. While the outcome of these meetings has not been positive, I remain optimistic. The negotiations must continue to bring peace to our friends in Cyprus.

For this reason, I am participating in this special order today. We must encourage the talks between the Greek and Turkish Cypriot leaders. We must continue to strive for peace not only in Cyprus, but also for other countries that do not know the freedoms we enjoy.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the comments of my colleague from California and salute him for the very active involvement that he has taken in this critical issue, particularly for taking the time and the energy to visit the island and see first hand the kind of policy that we could pursue in this country that would help to facilitate a solution to the conflict.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to another gentleman from California?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues on this occasion to celebrate the 25th anniversary of the independence of Cyprus. I commend my colleague from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] for scheduling this special order.

Mr. Speaker, as we well know, Cyprus' independence has a sad and turbulent history. It has been 11 years since Turkey invaded, occupied, and divided Cyprus. The Turkish invasion established a Turkish Cypriot sector in the northern part of the island and today there are some 30,000 Turkish soldiers there.

Many efforts have been made to bring about a settlement of the conflict on Cyprus. Most recently, the U.N. Secretary General's initiative was looked upon as the most promising means to bring about peace. Unfortunately, Turkish Cypriot leader Rauf Denktash rejected the Secretary General's plan. Significantly, he specifically rejected the condition for withdrawal of Turkish troops from the island, the threshold requirement for a solution to the Cyprus problem. He also indicated an unwillingness to make any concessions to achieve peace and stated that Turkish Cypriots refused to live in a mixed society with Greek Cypriots. The situation is now at an impasse, and we await further efforts to resolve the problems.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East, I have had the opportunity to sit through many hearings and to talk to many officials about the problems in Cyprus. Many of us opposed Mr. Denktash's unilateral declaration of independence because it is an obstacle to the completion of negotiations to reunify the island. Congress has tried to find ways to encourage the parties to negotiate an end to their conflict. Unfortunately, our efforts have not met with success, and in the final analysis it is up to the Greek and



Turkish Cypriots to find the will to reach solutions to the conflicts.

So it is with mixed feelings that I participate in this special order—mixed because I am happy to share in the celebration of Cyprus' independence, but sad that the country must exist divided and in conflict. Not until Cyprus is reunited will its people be truly free to enjoy the fruits of their independence. I want to take this opportunity to encourage both sides to redouble their efforts to reach an agreement. The people of Cyprus, and indeed the world, would welcome this happy result.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I thank my colleague from California for his active work in trying to find a solution to the conflict on Cyprus, and his very active work in support of strengthening our relationship with the country of Greece as well.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I am happy to yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] for his initiative in organizing this special order on Cyprus. This is especially pertinent, given the recent rejection by Turkish Cypriot leader Rauf Denktash, of the U.N. Secretary General's Cyprus initiative, agreed to in March by Cyprus President Spyros Kyprianou, the Greek Cypriot leader.

This has in effect—let us hope temporarily—dashed the hopes of the citizens of Cyprus that they might see an end to the 11-year occupation and division of their homeland. Since 1974, when 200,000 Greek Cypriots were driven from their home by invading Turkish soldiers, the tiny island has remained partitioned and occupied in part by the Turkish soldiers, as well as Turkish colonists who were lured from the mainland by the promise of land that had belonged to Greek Cypriots.

It is true that Turkey is an important United States ally, but we are dealing here with some fundamental issues of international law and morality. Turkey invaded and continues to occupy the territory of a formerly sovereign nation, and the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus is an illegal declaration of statehood, recognized by Turkey alone. Efforts by the United States urging Turkey to end its obstinacy and reach a solution have been to no avail, despite the generous amounts of aid granted to that country yearly. This special order serves as a vehicle in expressing the growing impatience among Members of Congress and the Nation at large over this process. American aid, in addition to being of strategic help to this nation, is supposed to reflect American values of justice and fair play. The Turks appear bent on a permanent division

of the island of Cyprus, and the issue continues to fester.

I hope that this special order might contribute to arriving at a just and equitable solution to the Cyprus issue.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I thank my colleague from California for joining us today in this special order.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] along with my other colleagues for the initiative he has demonstrated by taking out this special order on this truly historic day. It is action and involvement like his that is necessary now in order to encourage a solution to the problems of Cyprus which is so close and yet so far away. I would like to personally thank him and extend my hope that the gentleman will be an example which many others will follow.

Mr. Speaker, today the people of Cyprus celebrate an anniversary and I, too, would like to join my colleagues in extending my heartfelt congratulations to them on this, the silver anniversary, of the Republic's independence. I only wish and pray that this event were one that could be adequately marked by celebration alone. The unfortunate reality, however, is that there are many problems yet to be resolved before Cyprus can celebrate its true independence. It is our duty and obligation to draw attention to them.

Before we discuss the issue, however, I would like to take a moment to commend the brave and noble citizens of Cyprus for the resolve and strength of character they have demonstrated throughout these difficult years. The people of this island nation have had to endure many hardships, injustices, and insults throughout the years, but they have endured. Their loved ones have been lost, their families have been uprooted, their homes have been destroyed, but they continue to persevere. They are indomitable because justice is indomitable. Their right shall make right. This day truly belongs to them.

This is a day of which every Cypriot can be proud, for it marks a milestone in a long and just struggle for a free and independent country to call their own. The struggle continues and it is still just. The Cypriots continue to face many forces that threaten the independence of their country, and they continue to demonstrate the character and spirit that seeks to prevail in their noble cause. The international community must now step in and assist this just cause, for those forces that would undermine the integrity of Cyprus have been allowed to fester too long. It is now time for all freedom-loving nations, especially the

United States, to stand up and have their voices heard. It is time we speak up for what is right and fair in Cyprus. It is time we do our part to help Cyprus finally achieve the independence and sovereignty that it is celebrating.

Mr. Speaker, we, in Congress, are in a particularly favorable position to contribute to a resolution of the current stalemate which has left Cyprus partitioned into Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot sectors since the Turkish invasion of 1974. For this reason, I invited the Cypriot Ambassador to the United States, His Excellency Andrew J. Jacovides, to brief Members of Congress on the Cyprus issue on September 18. Mr. Jacovides' remarks were very useful, and informative, and emphasized the consistently positive stand of the Cyprus Government and the Greek Cypriot community during the various efforts toward a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus issue.

No one can deny that the Cypriot government and Greek-Cypriot community have done more than their fair share in encouraging a settlement throughout the years. They have made many painful concessions in an effort to bring harmony to the island which have not only not been matched by the other side, but have been thwarted by them. The Turkish-Cypriot community has even, in direct violation of relevant U.N. resolutions, taken a series of actions, subsequent to the 1974 invasion, which are aimed at consolidating the occupation and division of that small Mediterranean republic. For example, as recently as 1983, there was even an illegal attempt to create a new Turkish political entity in the occupied areas. Fortunately, this unprecedented secessionist action was promptly labeled as illegal and unacceptable by the international community and received the condemnation that is so well deserved. Yet it illustrates all too well the staunch and dogmatic attitude of the Turkish and Turkish-Cypriot communities which has prevented the attainment of a just solution to the problems of the republic throughout these long, sad years.

Their detrimental actions have not ceased there. Contrast the following if you will. First, Cyprus has agreed to place internal security and the protection of human rights of all Cypriots under international supervision for as long as necessary while Turkey refuses to accept any impartial third-party international body on Cyprus. Second, Cyprus has agreed to a bicameral legislative constitutional arrangement under which Greek and Turkish Cypriots will be represented equally in the upper house, that is, 50-50, and proportionally to the population ratio in the lower house, that is, 80-20 while Turkey demands 50-50 representation

in everything, even though Greek Cypriots outnumber the Turkish Cypriots 4 to 1. Third, Cyprus has agreed to a total demilitarization of the Republic of Cyprus to be replaced by an enlarged U.N. peace keeping force in order to allay any security fears of the Turkish Cypriot community while Turkey opposes the augmentation of the U.N. Force and demands an arrangement that would legalize her military presence in the sovereign state of Cyprus.

There cannot, of course, even be any pretext of legitimacy for the presence of a foreign power's military troops in a sovereign state. In fact, to anyone familiar with the issue, there can be no doubt that the paramount obstacle to a negotiated settlement, in addition to first, the issue of Greek-Cypriot areas to be returned, and, second, freedom of movement within regions after settlement has been, and continues to be, the issue of the Turkish troops on the island and the insistence by Turkey on maintaining those troops there even after a settlement is reached.

I am pleased to report that the issue of demilitarization was particularly well received by the Members who attended Ambassador Jacovides' briefing, and I am hopeful that recognition of this necessity by our colleagues in Congress will soon translate into positive action to help bring it about.

Turkey fails to realize that there may never be a settlement on Cyprus as long as they insist on maintaining foreign military troops there. Cypriot President Spiros Kyprianou first proposed demilitarization in 1978 at the special session of the United Nations on disarmament. It is, in fact, a basic prerequisite to a solution of the Cyprus problem. The demilitarization proposal, repeated by President Kyprianou in January 1984, contains two parts. First, it calls for the withdrawal of all Turkish occupation troops, together with the colonizers from Turkey. Second, at a later stage, all troops provided for under the Treaty of Alliance—Greek and Turkish contingents—would be withdrawn, and the Cyprus National Guard and the so-called Turkish-Cypriot Security Force should be dismantled. Demilitarization will contribute as an element of internal stability and alleviate Turkey's fears that Cyprus may be used against her militarily, but Turkey continues to resist all attempts to negotiate removal of her troops from Cyprus.

It is, therefore, up to us in Congress to encourage Turkey to begin negotiating in good faith and to convince her to begin to make some concessions of her own toward a settlement. Turkey is, after all, the third largest recipient of United States aid in this time of recordbreaking deficits at home, and it seems to me that the United States

can, and should, put some further conditions on receipt of that aid.

It is my hope that if progress continues to lag, the Congress will act to send a clear message to Turkey and to the Turkish-Cypriot community that we are tired of waiting and hearing false promises. We are tired of half-hearted negotiations which are doomed to failure in advance. We are tired of human rights violations. We are tired of property violations, and we are tired of subsidizing such illegal and immoral actions. We cannot wait any longer.

For the sake of the independence of a small nation, the stability of an entire region, and the peace of mind of thousands, I declare that the Cyprus problem must be settled and settled soon. Let us insist that all parties concerned act in good faith to ensure that a just solution is soon brought about. Thank you.

□ 1925

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Florida for a particularly compelling statement, one that I think very clearly lays out the gross inequities that exist in that country today and one that, as well, states very clearly, I think, the obstacles that exist for a peaceful settlement to the conflict.

I think that your call to action, that the Congress should follow, is one that should be circulated widely in the Congress, and is one of immense sensibility.

I thank the gentleman for his participation.

Mr. GILMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I would be very happy to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] who, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs has been a very constructive force for a long period of time, quite a number of years, on trying to reach a settlement to this conflict.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker today marks the 25th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Cyprus. After 90 years of British rule, the newly independent people of Cyprus looked with hope on the future of their small nation. Unfortunately, the fruits of independence have not been fully enjoyed by the people of Cyprus. That land was wracked by dissension and violence, often inspired by outsiders. In 1974, the Turkish invasion led to a division of the island and the uprooting of populations, leaving thousands homeless. Turkish troops have remained on Cyprus since 1974, and progress toward a political solution has been excruciatingly slow.

There has been some optimism in the past year in which the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities have been engaged in serious negotiations. U.N. Secretary General Perez de Cuellar has been untiring in his per-

sonal efforts to bring about a resolution of the situation on Cyprus. The Secretary General has circulated two drafts of a paper outlining a solution, each of which has been accented by one side. Now he is engaged in trying to bridge the gap between the two drafts—a gap which many observers believe is not very wide. The Secretary General deserves our praise for his past efforts and our encouragement as he continues to try to resolve this troublesome issue. I know that his work has been receiving strong support from the administration, which is entirely appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Cyprus deserve to live united and free of military occupation, in peace. They should be allowed to decide for themselves about their future. The 25th anniversary of an independent state is a sad time to have to contemplate about its impending return to true independence and to peace, but that is what we are all now hoping and praying for. With the cooperation and good will of all of the people of Cyprus, of Greece and Turkey, and all others who can bring their good offices to bear in support of an acceptable and just solution, hopefully we may be able to observe next October 1 as the 26th anniversary of a Cyprus united and at peace.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] for arranging today's special order in recognition of the 25th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Cyprus, and for providing us this opportunity to participate in this worthy discussion.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New York [Mr. GILMAN] very much for joining us in this special order today.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, on October 1, the Republic of Cyprus will celebrate its 25th anniversary of independence. While for most independent nations this would be an occasion of unqualified joy and festivity, for the people of Cyprus this quarter-century mark is also a painful reminder of their island's divided status.

The tragic history of the Cyprus conflict is well-known to members of this chamber. Shortly after independence, serious differences arose between Greek and Turkish Cypriots over the interpretation and implementation of their new constitution. In part this reflected age-old animosities and suspicions, but the intercommunal fighting contributed to further divisions between the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities. In 1964 the U.N. Security Council created a U.N. force in Cyprus which remains there to this day.

A decade later, following disturbances on the island, the Turkish government landed military forces and began the occupation of the northern part of the island. More than a third of the Cypriot population became refugees owing to this invasion. This mili-



tary occupation of northern Cyprus continues dividing the island today.

Despite this tragic past, Cyprus need not remain a nation divided. There appears to be considerable will among a majority of both Cypriot communities to find a peaceful settlement to their political dilemma through new constitutional arrangements. In the recent past, the United Nations has taken the lead in sponsoring a series of intercommunal talks between Greek and Turkish Cypriot leaders. Unfortunately, those talks have not proved fruitful to date. At various times both sides have been intransigent.

Future efforts to restore a federal government in Cyprus require that both sides show greater flexibility in their negotiating positions. For the time being, they should abstain from further acts which consolidate the island's divided status—acts such as the parliamentary and presidential elections held in the Turkish Cypriot north in June, or the proposal to allocate for Turkish settlement occupied lands belonging to displaced Greek Cypriots.

As much as some would like to think so, the solution of the Cyprus dispute does not lie with the Cypriots alone. Although the terms and structure of the settlement remain for them to work out, no real progress is likely without the good will and support of interested outside powers—Greece, Turkey, and the United States. The Governments of Greece and Turkey hold considerable sway over the Cypriot parties in the negotiations, and any settlement without their endorsement in word and deed has little chance of lasting success. Although Turkey has recently indicated that it intends to maintain troops on Cyprus as part of any settlement, it must realize that a key requirement for a durable solution is the withdrawal of Turkish forces from the island.

For its part, the United States must continue to actively support U.N. Secretary General de Cuellar's efforts to arrange further talks between the Cypriot leaders. In addition, we and our NATO allies should encourage Greece and Turkey to support negotiations. In doing so, we work toward the day when all Cypriots may celebrate their independence together.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, today, the 25th anniversary of Cypriot independence is an occasion for both commemoration and remorse. It is appropriate that we celebrate this 25th anniversary, while remembering that for 11 of those years the sovereignty of this small island nation has been under siege by foreign occupation of the northern half of its territory. The continuation of that occupation by Turkish forces is a sad comment on the resolve of a nearly united international community.

More than a decade of delay in reconstituting the nation of Cyprus after the Turkish invasion in 1974 has proved to be an insidious process. In international relations, as in politics, delay is a slow, quiet process of foreclosing options. By its nature, delay rarely causes headlines; all it does is compound problems and make their resolution more difficult.

There is an appearance of sameness in the basic equation on Cyprus ever since 1974: The island remains partitioned, with 40 percent of the land reserved for the 18 percent of the Cypriot population that happens to be of Turkish origin. This partition is maintained only through the occupation of northern Cyprus by more than 30,000 Turkish troops. Frustrated by the obstinacy of the Turkish occupation, the government of Cyprus has made one concession after another over the years in an attempt to accommodate the new, unpleasant realities on Cyprus and to make the nation whole once again. In that time, however, Turkey and Turkish-Cypriot leaders have employed the tactic of delay with escalating demands.

We usually debate the issue of Cyprus during foreign aid season in Congress. We do this due to our legitimate concern about the illegal use of American weapons in Cyprus over the years, and the need to decide whether to place additional restrictions on U.S. military aid to Turkey because of that concern. But such debate has a tragic repetitiveness. As Turkey and Turkish-Cypriot leaders move ahead with the process of establishing a permanent Turkish rump state on Cyprus, they pause once a year during congressional consideration of foreign aid legislation to send out encouraging signals amid a contrived flurry of diplomatic activity. If Congress takes some concrete action to encourage a settlement on Cyprus, Turkish-Cypriot Leaders scuttle the talks and blame Congress. If, however, Congress defers, trusting the promise of progress, the talks soon grind to a halt with the sudden appearance of new areas of Turkish-Cypriot concern.

There remains some hope for progress, however, due to the determined efforts of the U.N. Secretary General, who has worked for nearly 10 years in an attempt to achieve a mediated settlement on Cyprus. The Secretary General claims that he is the closest ever to a settlement of the problem of Cyprus, and that pressure must be placed on the parties involved to push the process to resolution. He also has warned that if negotiations do not move forward now, the process may be set back for years.

It remains to be seen just how responsive Turkey and Turkish-Cypriot leaders will be to the Secretary General's call for direct negotiations based on a proposed consolidated draft agreement he has put forward. The Governments of Cyprus and Greece accepted the consolidated agreement when the Secretary General first proposed it last April. The Turkish-Cypriots, however, delayed submitting any kind of reply until the end of August, and even then it was ambivalent and confusing.

To clarify the position of Mr. Denktash, the Turkish-Cypriot leader, the Secretary General arranged several meetings with Mr. Denktash in the past two weeks when he was in town for the convening of the 40th U.N. General Assembly. Little, however, was clarified. Mr. Denktash raised several nebulous concerns about the draft agreement, and declined to accept it even as a basis for negotiation. He requested another round of indirect talks to restructure the

draft agreement before direct negotiations could begin. Thus, it appears that we are not entering a final stage toward settlement, but yet another episode in the process of delay.

In a meeting the Secretary General had with members of the Foreign Affairs Committee 3 weeks ago, he was clearly frustrated by such delays. Although he was not yet willing to give up his initiative, he sounded the alarm on the need to push the reluctant parties toward settlement. Certainly, we in Congress should care about what happens on Cyprus for humanitarian reasons and for our belief in the importance of international law. But what should most drive our concern is the fact that delay is not a neutral process: over the past ten years it has led to a serious erosion of our vital interests in the southern flank of NATO.

A lack of settlement on Cyprus has enflamed the animosity between our important allies in the Eastern Mediterranean, Greece and Turkey. It has fueled Greece's transformation from a strong ally to virtual neutrality in East-West issues. If the process continues, we may soon find a radical nonaligned country in the Eastern Mediterranean. What is more, our relations with Turkey have not improved as our relations with Greece have deteriorated. As Turkish-Greek relations worsened, Turkey has increasingly demanded United States Preferential Treatment in aid and in bilateral issues between Greece and Turkey. Any United States support for a symbol of equity and balance, such as maintenance of the 7 to 10 ratio in aid, is seen as anti-Turkish.

This is a dangerous process for U.S. national interests, and we must not allow it to continue. If the Turkish-Cypriots do not agree to enter direct negotiations, it might take a dramatic gesture by the United States to break the current psychology of deadlock. In recent months, the Secretary General has stated that in his view, the Security Council has been underused as a forum for serious problem-solving. He has urged that the permanent members of the Security Council pick one or two issues that do not involve direct superpower confrontation, and on which the United States and the Soviet Union generally agree. The obvious choice is Cyprus, as was urged in the September 21 issue of *The Economist*, which I would like to submit for the record. This is indeed the year to shatter the impasse on Cyprus—it may be our last opportunity. We must use all the tools available to us to demand that real progress is finally made. Let us help turn the 25th anniversary into a new era of unity and independence on Cyprus.

[From the *Economist*, Sept. 21, 1985]

THE JEWEL IN THE UN

(By Perez de Cuellar)

When precious stones are embedded in lumps of coarse matter, it takes skilled craftsmen with plenty of patience to reveal their beauty. The jewel of peace is not easily perceived amid all the dross at such a big international gathering as the annual session of the United Nations assembly, which began on September 17th. This being

the 40th session, almost 100 heads of state or government will converge on New York to add their posturings and special pleadings to those of the 159 delegations. After weeks of speechmaking, about 300 resolutions and decisions will be voted, nearly all of them passing instantly into oblivion. And when the three-month talkathon is over many people will, as usual, wonder whether it was worthwhile.

Of course, in simple terms of productivity, these huge gatherings are not worthwhile. If most of the verbiage and vote-countings were cut away, the world would feel no loss. Nevertheless, at the heart of all the dross there may still be discerned something of value.

Unprecedentedly, a world of sovereign states has for 40 years remained agreed that it needs a near-universal organization with the primary purpose of maintaining peace. For all its weakness and wastefulness, the UN is the only such mechanism yet available. Blueprints for much better ones are ten a penny; but they are fated to remain mere blueprints so long as that characteristic of our times, the craving for national independence, endures. True peace-seekers should refrain from dreaming about ideal world organizations and concentrate on trying to make the one we have work better.

#### THE NEED TO SHOW IT CAN DO SOMETHING

Among the assembled throngs in New York there are some people who are more interested in making the UN work better than in using it as a loudhailer through which to shout slogans. Fortunately, one of them is the secretary-general. Mr. Perez de Cuellar cannot steer the assembly; he can only nudge it. But each September he gets a timely change to nudge it when he writes an introduction to his annual report on the organization's work. He has repeatedly urged the delegates to cut down on resolutions, repetitions and confrontational rhetoric—warning them, last year, that the UN "is a willing and patient horse, but it should not be ridden to a standstill". He has also sought their support for his nudging of the 15-member security council.

One of his suggestions this year is that the security council should make a "concerted effort to solve one or two of the major problems before it by making fuller use of the measures available to it under the charter". The council's members should invite Mr. Perez to expound this idea. It is not unthinkable that they should agree, instead of waiting for crises, to focus their minds on a persistent problem and to put their full weight behind a plan for settling it. Cyprus, maybe?

Sometimes—as in the 1964 Cyprus and 1973 Middle East crises—the council has proved remarkably valuable. Its usefulness could surely be increased by quite modest improvements in its working methods. Moreover, some of these might require no formal agreement; already at least one such beneficial change, the abandoning of the charter's provision that a permanent member's abstention should constitute a veto, has been achieved simply by tacit consent. And even amendment of the charter is not as inconceivable as is widely supposed. To grasp that point, the council's 15 members need only look around their horseshoe-shaped table. There would be only 11 of them there, if the charter had not been amended as long ago as 1965.

The UN needs, above all, a fresh demonstration that it can achieve something. Next week the security council is to hold a special meeting at which its member states' foreign

ministers will sit at that horseshoe table (Sir Geoffrey Howe presiding) and exchange ideas about the future of the council and the UN. If they refer to Mr. Perez's proposals at all, they may be inclined to pooch-pooch them as unrealistic. But 15 foreign ministers should be able, between them, to produce some realistic suggestions of their own for making more use of a mechanism which they still value.

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] for taking the initiative on this important issue. He has led the fight in support of peace on the island of Cyprus for the last several years, and has been very successful in keeping this issue before the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, today marks the 25th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Cyprus. Unfortunately, as has been the case for the past decade, this anniversary serves as a reminder to the Cypriot people—and to the world—of the tragedy that continues on that island. The 30,000 Turkish troops that have occupied the northern part of Cyprus since July 1974 remain in place. Turkey has also sent 50,000 colonists to bolster the Turkish representation on the island. This minority group, representing only 18 percent of the population, controls over 40 percent of the territory of the country.

Earlier this year, the Government of Cyprus accepted a draft agreement presented by U.N. Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar. However, Turkish Cypriot leader Rauf Denktaş dashed hopes for progress on the agreement, by refusing to agree to the withdrawal of Turkish military forces from the island, and by stating that there is no intention on the part of the Turkish Cypriots to live in a mixed society with Greek Cypriots. This kind of intransigence will only prolong the suffering of the people of both communities in Cyprus.

Mr. Speaker, the Turkish Cypriots—and Turkey—need to hear from the United States. The Reagan administration has practiced a policy of "quiet diplomacy" on the Cyprus issue—a policy that, unfortunately, has granted the Turkish Cypriots the space to dig their heels in even deeper. For the last 5 years, we have stood by while the Turkish Cypriots declared their independence and wrote their own constitution, held elections, and distributed lands to Turkish Cypriots which had been taken from Greek Cypriots at the time of the invasion. One can hardly call this progress in uniting the two communities.

Every year the administration has proposed massive increases in aid to Turkey, aid that is used by Turkey to maintain the occupation forces in northern Cyprus. However, this Congress has stood firm over the years in its belief that United States military assistance to Turkey must be tied to progress on the Cyprus issue. Without a clear message from the United States, Turkish and Turkish-Cypriot intransigence on this issue will continue.

Mr. Speaker, we must make it clear that an equitable resolution of the Cyprus conflict is a priority in United States foreign policy. Without pressure from the United

States in support of U.N. peace efforts, Cyprus will continue to mark the anniversary of its independence as a divided nation.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the unflagging spirit and independence of the people of the Republic of Cyprus who celebrate their 25th anniversary as a nation today.

Throughout its history the sovereign nation of Cyprus has maintained a close and important relationship with the United States. Strategically located on the southeastern flank of NATO there are two British bases and a United States radar base on the island. After the bombing of the Marine barracks in Beirut, Cyprus was the only country to permit the United States use of its facilities in the evacuation of the wounded.

Since 1974, Turkish troops have illegally occupied 40 percent of the island. Regardless of efforts by the United States and the United Nations, Turkey has shown little indication of a willingness to withdraw from Cyprus. We should take this occasion to recommit ourselves to sending a clear message to the Government of Turkey that meaningful negotiations must begin immediately. Future aid to Turkey should be dependent upon that government's willingness to negotiate and progress in settling the conflict based on democratic principles of majority rule with full minority rights.

It is my hope that the warm and friendly people of Cyprus will enjoy the next 25 years of independence in peace and prosperity.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join in this commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Cyprus. Twenty-five years ago, the people of Cyprus were freed from 90 years of British rule and 300 years under the Ottoman Empire. They looked to the future with hope.

Regrettably, in the years since independence, outsiders have interfered with the fate of that beautiful island; it still does not enjoy the unity and peace that it deserves. We recall with sorrow that in 1974, Turkey invaded Cyprus; 11 years later, Cyprus remains occupied by 25,000 troops, and 200,000 Greek Cypriots remain refugees.

This January, President Kyprianou of Cyprus and Mr. Rauf Denktaş, the leader of the Turkish Cypriot community, met in New York for the first summit-level talks between the two communities in 6 years. After the summit, United Nations Secretary-General Perez de Cuellar drafted a proposal which was not completely acceptable to the Greek Cypriot side. Nevertheless, important concessions were made by that side, so that a new revision was signed this March. Hopes for a quick settlement were dashed, however, when the Turkish Cypriot side refused to accept the revised version of the principles for peace.

Thus far, Mr. Denktaş has refused to accept such elementary propositions as the need for Turkish troops to end their occupation, and for the establishment of free-



dom of settlement and movement on the island.

The Secretary-General is continuing his work. On this anniversary of the independence of Cyprus, we must reaffirm our support for his efforts. Our Government must urge Mr. Denktash to make the concessions necessary to achieve real progress on this issue. The ball is in his court. Without strong pressure from the United States, and movement by Mr. Denktash, Cyprus will never achieve the independence that its people hoped for for years and thought they achieved 25 years ago today.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the people of the Republic of Cyprus who are today celebrating the 25th anniversary of their nation's independence. Since that independence, the Republic of Cyprus has been one of the United States' most trusted friends in this strategically important area of the world. Cyprus' humanitarian assistance to the United States during both the TWA hostage crisis and the evacuation of the marines wounded in the Beirut barracks bombing are only two of the most recent examples of this friendship. The people of Cyprus have experienced their share of adversity and disappointments in the short history of their nation. Yet today, on this important anniversary, the people of Cyprus have reason to believe that peace is close at hand and that true independence for both the Greek Cypriots and the Turkish Cypriots is not far away.

This optimism is founded on the recent successes of U.N. Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar's Cyprus peace initiative. After the summit talks between President Kyprianou and Mr. Rauf Denktash broke down in January of this year, Mr. Perez de Cuellar began a tireless effort to consolidate the principles agreed to during those face-to-face meetings. The result of these efforts was the completion of a draft consolidated agreement in March. This document addresses the fundamental issues to be resolved between Greek and Turkish Cypriots. The Secretary General's efforts provide the best vehicle yet for future peace on Cyprus. President Kyprianou has agreed to this draft of the consolidated document and we are hopeful that Mr. Denktash will do the same in the near future. Acceptance of this document will serve to pave the way for a peaceful resolution of this 11-year-old tragedy.

In light of these positive developments, I believe the United States should reaffirm our support for the Secretary General's efforts and our conviction that his efforts represent the best hope for peace in Cyprus. The good faith actions of all parties to the dispute can and will overcome any remaining roadblocks to peace. Our friends on Cyprus have suffered through 11 years of adversity; it is time for us to take the steps necessary to ensure this peace opportunity does not pass.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, we are gathered here this evening to commemorate an important date in the history of the Republic of Cyprus. Twenty-five years ago on October 1, the independent republic was established. Our Nation has certainly enjoyed

a beneficial relationship with Cyprus over those years, and I would like to express my appreciation to our friends in that regard.

It was Cyprus that allowed our country to use their airport after the terrorist bombing of our marines in Lebanon. That gesture will always be remembered by Americans as an example of the Cypriot good will.

Unfortunately, the people of Cyprus cannot fully enjoy this anniversary of their independence. As everyone knows, a force of foreign troops invaded their country in 1974, and remains there to this day. More recently, the Turkish Cypriots have tried to make permanent the partition of that island by forming a new government. So instead of celebrating the anniversary of their independence, many Cypriots will spend October 1 hoping for the return of their land, and a solution to this problem.

Those of us concerned with this issue turn our attention on this date to the efforts of United Nations Secretary General Perez de Cuellar to come up with a unification plan for Cyprus. Mr. de Cuellar has worked very hard this year to keep both sides negotiating, and his determination to resolve this matter is to be commended. It is my sincere hope that he will continue this very important process, despite the many obstacles that have been placed in his path by the officials of an illegal government.

At this moment in history, Mr. Speaker, we must rely on the success of the U.N. Secretary General to ensure the celebration of October 1 in the future by a truly independent Republic of Cyprus. Our prayers are with him.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague from Ohio for organizing this special order to commemorate the 25th anniversary of Cypriot independence.

I am glad to join with the people of Cyprus in celebrating this occasion. I only wish this 25th anniversary of independence weren't marred by the continued partition of the island of Cyprus.

Last year we engaged in a special order to focus attention on the fact that against the will of most of her people, Cyprus is a divided island. We may have had some success, and helped make people aware of the problem. But the progress that has been made, both in terms of international support for unification and congressional pressure on the Turkish Government to join us in efforts to reunify Cyprus, hasn't brought about a final resolution of the conflict.

The Cypriot Ambassador to the United States, Andrew Jacovides, recently met with several of our colleagues to discuss the background and recent developments of the Cyprus problem. As Ambassador Jacovides pointed out, we in Congress have the tools to help facilitate a peaceful solution to the problems in Cyprus. I am hopeful that our use of one of those tools last summer will hasten a resolution of the dispute.

We conditioned eligibility for a \$250,000,000 Cyprus Peace and Reconstruction Fund on acceptance by both sides of an agreement that makes meaningful

progress toward a final settlement of the partition dispute. In order to receive the aid, Greek and Turkish Cypriots must settle the Varosha-Famagusta question, agree on allowable foreign troop levels in the Republic of Cyprus, conclude an agreement on the disposition of Cyprus' international airport, or take other significant steps that show progress toward a settlement.

The majority of the people of Cyprus want a unified and independent state, and our fundamental belief remains that the interests of the United States and the Cypriot people would best be served by a bizonal, Federal solution. United Nations Secretary General Perez de Cuellar has given both sides in the dispute the opportunity to achieve such a solution. Perhaps the provision we adopted in the economic support fund will serve as an added encouragement toward acceptance of the Secretary General's plan.

Let us hope that both Greek and Turkish Cypriots mark the occasion of the anniversary of independence by resolving to finally settle the partition dispute.

Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Speaker, I address my colleagues today in recognition of the 25th anniversary of the creation of the Republic of Cyprus. On August 16, 1960, the island of Cyprus achieved its liberation from British colonial rule. Today, on the date officially recognized as the anniversary, we are compelled to take a moment to reflect upon the meaning of this important occasion.

The short 25 year history of this Republic has been marked by disturbing events—events which we all must come to terms with, and which necessitate our focusing particular attention on the significance of this anniversary.

If conditions were different, and we all wish that they were, we would be able to recognize this occasion in entirely positive terms. Unfortunately, this is not possible. We are unable to commemorate this event without addressing the unfortunate situation which currently prevails on the island of Cyprus. For as we all know, approximately 35,000 Turkish troops presently occupy over a third of the island—a military presence that is totally unacceptable, but that has persisted since the 1974 invasion. To compound the difficulties, unification talks between President Spyros Kyprianou and Turkish Cypriot leader Rauf Denktash have proven largely unproductive. And today, over 11 years after the 1974 invasion, the island remains divided. Indeed, in November 1983, northern Cyprus illegally declared itself an independent state, an action which was condemned by the U.N. Security Council.

And this, my distinguished colleagues, places a particular burden on our shoulders. It creates for each and every one of us a responsibility to speak out in the name of justice. I would say first that it is imperative that the United States vigorously pursue a peaceful, mutually agreeable settlement to the ongoing dispute. We must make it perfectly clear that we remain

firmly committed to this cause. Anything short of a persistent and determined effort on the part of our nation will signal an acceptance of the present situation. And let there be no question that the existing situation is one which contradicts our most valued notions of justice and international law.

I think, finally, that the ultimate significance of our recognizing today's occasion lies in the very reason for this anniversary—that being that this date marks the creation of a very specific national entity, one which was founded in accordance with very specific principles of government. And let us not lose sight of this very basic, and yet critical observation. We recognize today the original and official Republic of Cyprus, precisely as it was established on the day of liberation 25 years ago. We do not recognize any partition of the island, nor do we recognize any government except that which was originally created to govern the Republic in its entirety. We are morally compelled to uphold this position, and we must do so if we are to remain true to the very principles of democracy which provide the basis for our own system of government. And if there is one single thought which we must emphasize today, it is simply that by recognizing this anniversary, we are in effect reaffirming our commitment to an independent Republic of Cyprus, one which is free of geographical partitions, as well as of destabilizing and unlawful military occupation.

In closing, I would like to add that I recognize this anniversary with a deep appreciation for the significance and meaning of the liberation of Cyprus, and with a profound respect for the sovereignty and independence of the Republic that was created by this liberation. And, finally, I recognize this anniversary with the hope that someday in the near future the Republic of Cyprus will be freed of the internal strife that has marked so much of its short history.

Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, today the people of Cyprus mark the 25th anniversary of the independence of their country. This momentous occasion, however, is overshadowed by the continued division of that nation, and the, as yet, unresolved fate of its Greek and Turkish populations.

The tragedy of Cyprus must not be allowed to continue indefinitely. The artificial division of the Republic of Cyprus is dangerous not only for the Cypriots, but for the whole Eastern Mediterranean region. It places American security interests in the region in jeopardy and remains the greatest obstacle to the restoration of good relations between Greece and Turkey, the anchors of NATO's southeastern flank.

The recent efforts on the part of the U.N. Secretary-General to broker a negotiated settlement on Cyprus offers reason for hope. In January, Cypriot President Kyprianou and Turkish Cypriot leader Denktash met for the first time in 5 years. Although no agreement was reached, negotiations are still underway. A draft agreement prepared by Secretary-General Perez de Cuellar was

accepted by President Kyprianou but was later rejected by Mr. Denktash.

On this anniversary, I believe we must reaffirm our dedication to finding a peaceful solution to the Cyprus conflict. The recent humanitarian assistance given by Cyprus to the TWA hostages demonstrates the friendship that the people of Cyprus feel for our country. It is incumbent upon us now to help in their efforts to negotiate stability for the next 25 years.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, today the Republic of Cyprus celebrates the 25th anniversary of its independence. Sadly, the anniversary is marred by the continued division and occupation of their nation for the past decade.

The citizens of Cyprus have looked with hope to the United Nations Secretary-General's Cyprus initiative as the best means available to bring a long-awaited peace to their country.

The original U.N. proposal dealt with the amount of territory to be held by each side in the Cyprus dispute, the powers of the states and the Federal Government, and withdrawal of Turkish troops.

In January of this year, summit talks were held between President Kyprianou of Cyprus and Mr. Rauf Denktash to try and find a peaceful solution to the situation in Cyprus. Although these talks ended inconclusively, they established the principles that would be included in any future peace agreement for Cyprus.

After the summit, President Kyprianou played an integral role in Mr. Perez de Cuellar's efforts to draft a revised version of documentation which formed the basis for the January talks. In an unprecedented act of good faith, President Kyprianou made a substantial number of painful concessions in an effort to ensure a positive response from Mr. Denktash. In March of this year President Kyprianou signed the consolidated document for peace.

Unfortunately, in August 1985, Mr. Denktash diplomatically rejected the Secretary-General's consolidated document. In his reply, Mr. Denktash indicated that he would not accept the condition for the withdrawal of the more than 30,000 Turkish troops from Cyprus, the threshold requirement for any lasting solution to the crisis in Cyprus.

We in this country must do all we can to keep alive the possibility of a peaceful and united Cyprus. A successful solution would play an important role for improving relations between Greece and Turkey. It would shore up NATO's eastern flank, and, at long last, allow Greek and Turkish Cypriots to work together for a peaceful and prosperous future.

Since January, however, Mr. Denktash, with Ankara's approval, has continued to take steps to ensure the permanent partition of Cyprus. Since January, these measures have included the following:

Mr. Denktash held a referendum in May to adopt a new constitution for the occupied zone.

Mr. Denktash held presidential and parliamentary elections in June.

In June, Mr. Denktash announced the distribution of thousands of acres of land owned by Greek Cypriots in the occupied zone to Turkish Cypriots.

Today the people of Cyprus mark the 25th anniversary of their independence. Unfortunately, this sovereign nation will not enjoy the fruits of this freedom until their nation is once again united and free of occupation forces. A clear indication of our support for the cause of freedom on Cyprus offers the only hope for peace.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in commemorating this very important day. I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. FEIGHAN, for his outstanding leadership and initiative in calling this special order.

October 1, 1985 marks the 25th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Cyprus. Cyprus has maintained a close relationship with the United States throughout its 25-year history, and recently provided critical logistical support for the American peacekeeping forces in Lebanon. Moreover, Cyprus was the only country to permit the United States use of its facilities in the evacuation of the wounded Marines after the Beirut bombing.

Since 1974, Turkey has occupied 40 percent of Cypriot territory, even though Turkish Cypriot make up less than 20 percent of the island's population. The United Nations has attempted to resolve this dispute, and the Congress and the administration have also worked to facilitate a lasting, peaceful settlement. In a wider geopolitical context, the continuation of the Cypriot discord also has important implications for NATO and Greek-Turkish relations. Clearly, we have a strong national interest in preserving intercommunal harmony on the island and in solving the basic disagreements between the parties.

As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I have been actively engaged in efforts to pressure Turkey to end the occupation, and to force an agreement which respects the rights and interests of both sides. I will continue to be involved in this issue.

I think this special order will serve to remind members of the importance of Cyprus to the United States and for the need of the Turkish Cypriot community to be much more forthcoming in negotiations.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] for organizing today's special order on the Cyprus situation. Today's special order, on the 25th anniversary of Cyprus independence, serves both as an important reminder to our colleagues that the crisis in Cyprus continues, and as a call to this Congress for a renewed effort in resolving the conflict.

Cyprus remains a nation divided. I am deeply concerned that steps such as the exchange of Ambassadors with the Turkish Government, and the distribution to Turkish Cypriots of land owned by Greek Cypriots in the occupied zone, will not serve to advance peace negotiations in that troubled country.



I urge my respected colleagues to take note of United Nations Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar's efforts toward a negotiated peace in Cyprus. This spring, the Secretary General negotiated concessions from Cyprus President Kyprianou, and presented Mr. Denktash with a consolidated document for peace. This document was rejected by Mr. Denktash. The United Nations peace initiative will continue, and our cooperation, participation, and support of that determined effort is needed.

Our role in this situation, however, must focus not only on Cyprus, but also on our NATO alliance. The conflict between Greece and Turkey, both NATO allies, must not continue to upset the NATO stability in that critical region. A delicate balance must be struck in our treatment of those nations as NATO allies and players in this tragic division of Cyprus.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come for this nation to reevaluate our policies concerning the Cyprus situation. The need for negotiation and concessions remains, and a positive role by this Congress is needed to bring peace and an independent government to the now 25 year independent Nation of Cyprus.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. Speaker, on this October 1, 1985, the people of Cyprus are marking the 25th anniversary of their independence. While this occasion normally would be a cause for celebration, today, the people of Cyprus will observe this anniversary with a sense of sadness.

There have been hopes, over the past year, that some progress would be forthcoming in resolving the problems on Cyprus. The promising initiatives undertaken by United Nations Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar and the subsequent meetings held between President Kyprianou and Mr. Denktash increased hopes for a peaceful settlement.

While no such settlement is on the immediate horizon, we, in the Congress, continue our support for a fair resolution on the conflicts on Cyprus. Hopefully, with everyone working together and committed to a fair resolution, future anniversaries will be a joyous occasion and not a bitter reminder of conflict.

Mr. PASHAYAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the special order to commemorate our Nation's close ties with the Republic of Cyprus on the 25th anniversary of its independence. I should like to commend my colleague from Ohio, EDWARD FEIGHAN, for coordinating this effort.

I wish to congratulate the people of Cyprus on the 25th anniversary of their independence. The United States has a close friend in this young Nation. Cyprus provided assistance during the evacuation of wounded U.S. Marines from Beirut barracks and during the TWA hostage crisis, to mention just two of many humanitarian acts. I want the people of Cyprus to be aware that we appreciate this assistance.

This year we have been hopeful that peace is at hand at last in Cyprus. In January, Mr. Rauf Denktash, a Turkish Cypriot leader, agreed to meet with President

Kyprianou for the first time in 6 years. This meeting occurred as a direct result of the clear message the 98th Congress sent to Turkey that their intransigence would not be tolerated. While the historic meeting ended inconclusively, it established the principles for a peaceful resolution of the conflict. We were all hopeful that the good faith Mr. Denktash displayed by agreeing to participate in the meeting would continue afterward and would produce a resolution of the remaining outstanding issues between the two communities.

Unfortunately, on this 25th anniversary date, there has been no resolution of the issues. Mr. Denktash has refused to commit himself to further negotiations, has termed the meeting a failure, and has implied that existing agreements struck at the meeting would have to be renegotiated. Mr. Denktash has held presidential elections, parliamentary elections, and a constitutional referendum in the occupied zone. Last month Mr. Denktash announced the conveyance of thousands of acres of land owned by Greek Cypriots in the occupied zone. In addition, Ankara and Mr. Denktash are continuing the illegal colonization of the occupied zone with Turkish peasants, who now number 50,000. All of these acts are contrary to the cause of peace and serve to drive a larger wedge through a nation already divided. Furthermore, statements from Ankara and Mr. Denktash that Turkish troops shall remain in Cyprus after a peace agreement is reached suggest that partition, not peace, may be Turkey's goal.

Unlike Mr. Denktash, President Kyprianou has been most forthcoming since the termination of the meeting. Since January, President Kyprianou has played an integral role in U.N. Secretary-General Perez de Cuellar's efforts to draft a revised version of the documentation that formed the grounds for the January talks. In an unprecedented act of good faith, President Kyprianou made a substantial number of painful concessions in an effort to elicit a positive response from Mr. Denktash. The concessions were made despite Mr. Denktash's refusal to participate in the Secretary-General's initiative. In March 1985, President Kyprianou signed the consolidated document for peace.

Unfortunately, this past August, the Secretary-General's consolidated document was diplomatically rejected by Mr. Denktash. In his reply Mr. Denktash indicated he would not accept the condition for the withdrawal of Turkish troops, nor would he make any concessions to achieve peace. He also stated his conviction that Turkish Cypriots shall refuse to live in a mixed society with Greek Cypriots.

We all recognize that Turkey has a special responsibility for promoting the peaceful resolution of the crisis. Clearly, Ankara has not lived up to its responsibility. Our patience is being sorely tried. Turkey must recognize from the actions of the 98th Congress and from previous Congresses that we are serious in our efforts to bring the two sides together. Our goal is and shall remain that the Republic of Cyprus shall be allowed to experience and to enjoy the free-

dom and independence it was granted 25 years ago today.

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, in 1960 the Republic of Cyprus was founded and today we commemorate the 25th anniversary of this beautiful but troubled land. Would that we could celebrate this occasion with the knowledge that the problems dividing this small island nation and the long and bloody struggle there have been ended. But today, sadly, a decade after the 1974 Turkish invasion, Cyprus remains a deeply troubled country and no negotiated settlement has been achieved.

What we can do today, however, is celebrate our long-standing friendship with the Republic of Cyprus and reaffirm our commitment to a peaceful resolution of the continuing conflict on the divided island. We can affirm our commitment to basic human rights for the people of Cyprus and our commitment to the sovereign borders of both Greece and Cyprus. We can reaffirm our commitment to establishing a genuine and lasting peace through meaningful negotiations.

In doing so, we send a message of hope to the people of Cyprus. There can be no illusions about the congressional mood and the unswerving belief of the American people in self-determination and self-rule under a united government. There can be no doubt as to our continuing interest and efforts in behalf of an equitable resolution.

The brave people of Cyprus deserve no less. They deserve to know that their quarter century anniversary is to be applauded and that the tragic situation on their beloved island is of concern to the world. We are, indeed, all linked, country to country, by our efforts to achieve fundamental human rights for all people.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues today in this special order to celebrate the 25th anniversary of the independence of Cyprus. Unfortunately, continual Greek and Turkish division of this nation prohibit Cypriots from enjoying this freedom.

I applaud the efforts of U.N. Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar who is currently undertaking sustained efforts for peace between the NATO countries. In January, he drafted a proposal for reunification of a federation and along with congressional pressure, spawned a summit meeting between Turkish leader Denktash and Greek leader Kyprianou. Regrettably, the summit proved unsuccessful.

Reaffirmation of such pressure could ensure Cyprus' hopes for a peace settlement and eventually eliminate the possibility of a disastrous war. Furthermore, the summit collapse indicates the incessant need for U.S. involvement so that permanent partition may be avoided. Progress of the U.N. Secretary General and U.S. intervention may provide the last real opportunity to bring long-awaited peace to Cyprus.

I am pleased to support this celebration of Cyprus' independence and, in addition, call for continued efforts by the United States to help stabilize this troubled nation.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the people of Cyprus on this, the 25th anniversary of their country's independence. While this occasion should be a cause for great celebration, the people of Cyprus will mark this day with sadness, as it serves as a bitter reminder of the continuing division and occupation of their nation.

The United States has a good friend in Cyprus, as Cyprus President Kyprianou has repeatedly demonstrated. I am sure we all remember their valuable assistance in the evacuation of wounded marines from Lebanon and, more recently, their help in resolving the TWA hostage crisis. For these reasons alone, we should reaffirm our commitment to the resolution of the Cyprus conflict. But in addition, we must also bear in mind that our own security interests in the region dictate that we take any and all steps to bring peace to this troubled nation.

Our hopes for peace on Cyprus now rest with the initiatives undertaken by U.N. Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar. Expectations of progress were raised early this year by a summit meeting between President Kyprianou and Mr. Rauf Denktaş. Unfortunately, that meeting and subsequent actions have proved inconclusive, although negotiations continue.

It has been over a decade since Turkish troops invaded and partitioned Cyprus. I urge my colleagues to take note of the continuing suffering of the Cypriots, the danger to NATO security posed by this persistent conflict, and the growing demand of the American people for a peaceful and speedy resolution to the stalemate on Cyprus. Freedom and true independence on Cyprus can only come with the removal of all foreign troops. I am sure we all join together to commemorate our longstanding friendship with the Republic of Cyprus and to send the Cypriots a message of hope on this important anniversary.

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues from Ohio, Congressman ED FEIGHAN, in this special order commemorating the 25th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Cyprus. I would like to commend his initiative in calling this special order and direct the attention of my colleagues to the significance of this date in the history of the Cypriot people.

Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago, Cyprus ceased to exist as a British colony and once again, after centuries of domination by foreign powers, became an independent republic. However, independence in 1960 did not bring the peace that was hoped for. Instead, the decades that have followed have brought the Cypriot people violence and bloodshed. However, they have also demonstrated the everlasting courage and perseverance of the Cypriot people and renew our hope that this small island in the Mediterranean will once again enjoy the benefits of peace and freedom.

This past July 20, the international community again mourned the passing of yet another year since the illegal occupation of Cyprus 11 years ago. Eleven years ago, Turkish troops violated this small nation's

territorial integrity by invading the island and wreaking havoc and destruction among the island's inhabitants. Today, 11 years later, 18,000 Turkish troops still occupy over 40 percent of Cyprus and pose an ominous threat to the island's Greek Cypriot population.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we diligently persevere in negotiating a solution to this problem. Since summit talks between Cypriot President Kyprianou and Turkish Cypriot leader Denktash collapsed last January, Mr. Denktash has held both parliamentary and presidential elections in his illegally occupied northern portion of Cyprus. Indications are that the Turkish Government intends to continue maintaining Turkish troops on the island even after a settlement. Recently, the U.N. Secretary General reported the preparation of a draft agreement which represents a judicious settlement. Though the Greek Cypriots have accepted the agreement, the Turkish Cypriots have not yet replied.

It is my hope that an affirmative reply will be given and that the international community will bolster efforts for a just and timely settlement.

Twenty-five years ago, Cyprus was a budding republic tasting its first taste of freedom. Twenty-five years later, Cyprus may be an independent republic but it is partitioned and its people are divided. It is our moral responsibility to work to ensure that the illegal occupation of Cyprus and the tragedy of the division is not prolonged.

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, on this, the 25th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Cyprus, I would like to join my colleagues to offer my congratulations to the people of Cyprus, as well as offer my support for the continued efforts to bring about a negotiated settlement to the 11-year dispute which has divided the Mediterranean nation.

Throughout its 25-year history, Cyprus has remained a faithful ally of the United States, as most recently demonstrated by her help following the bombing of our Marine Corps headquarters in Beirut, and the TWA hijacking incident in Lebanon. Unfortunately, since 1974, Turkey has occupied 40 percent of the Cypriot territory, and has insisted on maintaining a separate nation, under the direct control of Ankara. U.N. Secretary General Perex de Cuellar has admirably continued his efforts to achieve an agreement between the two Cypriot communities, but he steadfast refusal of Turkey to cooperate has stalled any final accord.

The United States' reluctance to confront Turkey's disregard for the basic tenets of international law, on the Cyprus issue, as well as the Armenian genocide, is unfortunate. No one questions the value of our alliance with the Republic of Turkey. That relationship, however, must be based on mutual respect and understanding. The United States has, regrettably, been fooled into thinking that we can remain friends with Turkey only if we do not demand the same allegiance to human rights, that we expect of others, ally and foe, alike.

Today, the 25th anniversary of the Republic of Cyprus, is an appropriate time to call for her unification as well. Hopefully, such pleas will not have to be heard next October 1.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my colleagues in the House of Representatives in commemorating the 25th anniversary of the creation of the Republic of Cyprus.

Twenty-five years ago, on August 16, 1960, Cyprus formally was removed from British control, and became an independent republic, establishing a representative constitutional government committed to fundamental principles of human rights for all of its citizens. The new country joined the community of free nations of the world, embarking upon an ambitious program of land reform, agricultural growth, and conservation programs.

Throughout its history as an independent state, the Republic of Cyprus has remained committed to the cause of freedom, and has maintained a close and friendly relationship with the United States. The Republic of Cyprus has provided critical logistical support for American troops in the Middle East, and recently, the United States used the country's facilities in the evacuation of wounded marines after the U.S. military compound in Beirut was bombed by terrorists.

Although this 25th anniversary should be a joyous occasion for the people of Cyprus, it is instead one of sadness, for it has been over 11 years since the armed forces of Turkey invaded this small country, occupying nearly 40 percent of the northern part of the island and forcing about 200,000 Greek Cypriots to flee south. There is extensive documented evidence of gross atrocities and crimes committed by the Turks during this invasion, and over 1,500 Greek Cypriots are still missing from this conflict.

Mr. Speaker, today, however, there is hope for a peaceful resolution to this division and occupation by the Turks. Initiatives have been undertaken by the Secretary General of the United Nations, and President Kyprianou of the Republic of Cyprus met earlier this year with the leader of the so-called Turkish Federated State of Cyprus. On this 25th anniversary of the formation of the Republic of Cyprus, let us reaffirm our commitment to this government, and let us hope that the Republic of Cyprus is reunified and returned to its former status as an independent country, whose people are free to determine their own destinies without foreign domination or occupation.

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 25th anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Cyprus.

For the people of Cyprus, this day marks more than a remembrance of things past—it stands also as a symbol of promise and hope for the day when all the inhabitants of this resplendent island can live together in peace and harmony. So on this day, I believe it is appropriate not only to speak of Cyprus' independence, but also to offer a



word of encouragement to those who would bring peace to this troubled land.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the United Nation's Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar has undertaken negotiations with Cyprus President Kyprianou and Mr. Rauf Denkash. It is my heartfelt hope that these discussions will further the cause of friendship among the various peoples of Cyprus, and pave the way to a just and lasting intercommunal peace. Only in this way can the vision of an independent Cyprus—dedicated to the principles of democracy, unity and freedom—be realized for all the island's inhabitants.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to participate in today's special order commemorating the 25th anniversary of independence for the Republic of Cyprus and wish to congratulate President Kyprianou. Under normal circumstances, a country's anniversary of independence should be a cause for celebration but the facts are that the Republic of Cyprus remains today a divided island plagued by age-old conflicts. Many problems still stand in the way of peace and reconciliation. We are hopeful, however, that in the near future the island's Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities will be able to work out their differences. We are to commend the U.N. Secretary General, Mr. Perez de Cuellar, for his Cyprus initiative and hope that through his efforts an end to the tensions will be brought about.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have the chance to speak in recognition of the 25th anniversary of the independence of Cyprus. As we approach this anniversary, we are reminded of the illegal occupation of a portion of Cyprus. Unfortunately, this division keeps the sovereign nation of Cyprus from truly celebrating its date of independence.

But there is hope for a peaceful solution between the Greek and Turkish occupants of Cyprus. Thanks to the efforts of U.N. Secretary General Mr. Perez de Cuellar, a draft initiative for Cyprus contains the seeds of hope. The initiative calls for the removal of Turkish troops, and it is aimed at reuniting the island as a federation through U.N.-mediated negotiations.

The Turkish Cypriot leader, Mr. Denkash, has continued to be inflexible in attempts at a peaceful resolution to the problem. Mr. Denkash is opposed to the withdrawal of Turkish troops from Cyprus, and his attempts to organize elections or to adopt a new constitution for the occupied zone, could destroy all present hopes for a peaceful resolution.

As we are the major suppliers of arms and technical support for the Turkish military, we must use this influence to persuade Turkey to show more flexibility in negotiating peaceful solutions to the Cyprus problem. Our military assistance to Turkey is provided under the condition that it be used for defensive purposes only. We must take a more responsible stance in insisting that the aid not be used for the offensive military activities that Turkey is now engaged in.

I have previously been a strong supporter of House Resolution 4505, a bill that would terminate our assistance program to Turkey unless action is taken to revoke the illegal declaration of independence of the rump Turkish state of Cyprus. I continue to feel that this is the type of pressure needed by the United States to convince the Turkish Government to be flexible in bringing about the unification of the peoples of Cyprus.

It has been the U.S. policy to support democratic nations. We cannot solve all the problems of Cyprus, but progress on this issue can be made if our Government does what is necessary to encourage Turkey to change its present policies.

Mr. ECKART of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my friend and distinguished colleague from northeast Ohio for convening this opportunity to discuss the need for constructive change in Cyprus and to reaffirm our support for the citizens of that beleaguered nation.

Today we recognize the 25th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Cyprus. In so doing, we also recognize the potential for a rebirth in that republic. The people of Cyprus, through patience and compromise, are seeking to achieve a lasting peace and understanding. We must use all of our influences to assist in uniting this land.

In order to accomplish this mission there must be more visible diplomatic attention given to the search for understanding in this region. As my colleagues have stressed, the United States must more actively support United Nation efforts to correct the years of tragic conflict. We can not leave the people of Cyprus split and adrift.

As Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots begin to outline provisions for a fair and equitable constitution and discuss the implications of territorial divisions, let us, at the very least, offer our support and objective assistance in the negotiation process. The U.S. goal in this matter should be to support and persistently pursue peaceful dialog leading to eventual permanent resolution of their grievances.

We have many reasons to be concerned with the outcomes of these deliberations. Their stability is a guard to our military and economic interests in that region. The strength of NATO's southern flank is at question. The political unrest of the entire Middle East can be eased if the Cyprus situation is resolved.

We cannot pretend that this process of negotiation will be easy. It requires substantial patience and compromise from both sides of the table. It also demands our unyielding support and initiative for the task at hand: Peace for Cyprus and for Greece and Turkey. Today, as we look back on the 25 years of the Republic of Cyprus, let us send a message of hope and goodwill for the future of that republic.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, we have conducted this special order to reaffirm our commitment to the freedom and independence of Cyprus. Though some differ on the methods, we are united in Congress in our

friendship with that nation, and our constant hopes for the renaissance of its true and well-deserved independence. May this anniversary mark not the bitterness of its division, but the courage of its people in their struggle for unity.

## TWO AMERICAN JOURNALISTS INJURED OR KILLED IN AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RUDD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, information on Afghanistan is scarce, to be sure, because of Soviet censorship. By closing Afghan territory to American television and Western reporters, by imprisoning journalists and others who have entered the country clandestinely, the Soviets have effectively kept the Afghan horror story from being told.

Late last night, Mr. Speaker, wire service reports indicated that two reporters, two American journalists from the Arizona Republic newspaper were injured, and possible killed, while on assignment in Afghanistan.

The two journalists were on a brave, uncertain, and perilous assignment. They were also one of the few sources of information and news we Americans have from that war-torn country.

I regret deeply this news and wish to express my sincerest sympathies to their families and deepest respect to their colleagues. My hopes and prayers are that we soon learn of their whereabouts and fate, and I urge the State Department and other agencies here in Washington and abroad to do everything in their power to quickly learn the correct circumstances surrounding these two men and make efforts for their return to our country.

□ 1935

## NATIONAL DEFENSE FOUNDATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in January of this year the NonCommissioned Officers Association of the USA [NCOA] established a new and very unique foundation. It is NCOA's National Defense Foundation [NDF]. It is unique because it is not another big weapons, faster airplanes organization. Rather like its parent NonCommissioned Officers Association, the National Defense Foundation is a people organization. The NDF advocates "peace through strength" but recognizes the strength of our Armed Forces is not measured

exclusively in the number of warheads we stockpile or the number of main battle tanks we field. Rather, the strength of our forces resides in the strength of our men and women in uniform. It is their will and the will of the citizens of the United States to support them which makes this Nation strong. It is the goal of the NDF to develop that will among service members and the public and to promote a better understanding of both military manpower and the military family issues.

I am among the more than 250,000 members of NCOA who support this foundation and its work. Accordingly, I rise today Mr. Speaker, to bring to the attention of my colleagues news of the efforts this fine organization has already begun and to create awareness of its plans for the future.

In the months ahead, the foundation will hold a series of Capitol Hill briefings designed to stress the importance of a strong commitment to the manpower areas of our total defense posture. Those quality of life issues that are receiving long overdue attention by the services will be fully developed for interested representatives and their staff. The issues which will be discussed are those of importance to the men and women of our Armed Forces such as: Military pay, retirement, on and off base housing facilities, medical care, CHAMPUS, education programs, and travel allowances. All of these will be covered in depth along with others which impact on the readiness of the services.

These are important components in the defense of our country. The defense of this Nation centers around our ability to attract and retain the right quality and quantity of personnel and to solicit from them the dedication and esprit de corps necessary to properly defend this country and her allies.

A companion program being developed by NCOA's National Defense Foundation involves educating our college students in the service's manpower areas. An intern program is being initiated to support those students interested in understanding the importance of this component of our total defense.

Additionally, the foundation has undertaken a program to recognize those who have served and are serving in our Nation's Armed Forces. Using direct mail, the association made possible the distribution of more than 6,000 appreciation cards to hospitalized veterans this past Fourth of July. A similar program we hope will be equally successful this coming Veterans Day.

But the real centerpiece of the NDF's activities, Mr. Speaker, is its effort in military voter registration.

The foundation will build around the success NCOA has achieved in assisting our military community sta-

tioned across this country and overseas to register and vote. Nonpartisan voter registration drives conducted in conjunction with the Department of Defense will be implemented throughout the military establishment. Operating through NCOA's chapters situated on and near most major defense installations worldwide, the foundation will strive to reach its goal of 1 million new registered voters from our 5 million member military family for the 1986 elections and beyond.

Last year, NCOA assisted in registering over 200,000 military personnel and their dependents. Following the lead set by the Department of Defense, NCOA was an integral part of last year's historic military voter registration drive. For the first time, the number of military personnel and their dependents who registered to vote surpassed the national average. The foundation will continue to focus attention and resources on military voter registration programs.

Working closely with the Department of Defense, the foundation has put together and published the NCOA National Defense Foundation voter registration kit. This kit vastly simplifies the procedure used by our service personnel, their dependents, and our overseas citizens when they register to vote. This group of citizens, some 7.5 million in number, almost all use the Federal postcard application to register to vote absentee. The NCOA voter registration kit instructs them on how to fill out this form for their particular State.

One primary goal of the foundation is to provide this kit free of charge to every base and fleet commander, voting assistance officer, and NCOA trained volunteer worldwide.

Coupled with this registration drive, the foundation will continue its efforts to work with individual State legislatures in an attempt to end the disenfranchisement faced by many service personnel stationed at sea or overseas. In March of this year, the National Defense Foundation sent out over 4,000 letters to State representatives asking them to support legislation allowing greater transit time for their States absentee ballots. I would like the NCOA letter and attached newspaper clippings that deal with this important issue to be included in the RECORD. For too many States still disenfranchise their citizens who vote absentee by mailing out their absentee ballots less than a month before the election. This is inadequate time for the ballot to get to our service community at sea or overseas and back.

Another problem faced by our military and overseas community is the absence of current information about the candidates seeking office. The foundation is developing a communication system linking candidates with potential voters so that both parties

come away winners. I have enclosed a list showing the number of potential absentee voters per State. I would ask that this list be entered into the RECORD. These are our constituents and they should not be forgotten.

The number of U.S. representatives and their staff that have service experience is on a sharp decline. This has produced a need to focus on the manpower issues in the same in-depth manner provided by our defense weapons systems manufacturers. Both representatives and staff need to be educated on the special concerns and interests of our service community in order to communicate effectively with these constituents.

All of these programs center around our constituents. Their duty assignments take them out of our States for extended periods of time. It is very important that we communicate with them as we do our other constituents so that they know our stands on key issues and how it affects their country, State, and finally themselves. With the help of the Noncommissioned Officers Association and their National Defense Foundation, our service personnel and their dependents will be registering and voting in historic numbers next November. I would like you to join with me in contacting NCOA's National Defense Foundation to further examine the programs they have to offer and to support them in implementing these important programs aimed at assisting our defense community.

THE NATIONAL DEFENSE FOUNDATION OF THE NON COMMISSIONED OFFICERS ASSOCIATION,

San Antonio, TX.

DEAR LEGISLATOR: According to a Department of Defense survey, approximately 182,000 military personnel who tried to vote in the 1980 presidential election were unable to do so. They received their absentee ballots too late or not at all. In 1984 an historic number of servicemembers and their dependents registered to vote so the numbers of disenfranchised will be even higher.

The basic problem is that regardless of how early voters apply, many local election officials do not have ballots printed and ready to mail until less than three weeks before the election. As is explained in the enclosed USA Today article, that is simply not enough time for the ballot to make the round-trip if the voter is overseas or at sea. Our Association, along with the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, has adopted national resolutions calling upon the states to mail ballots at least 45 days before the election, so that military personnel will have ample time to vote no matter where the service of our country has taken them.

In addition to providing more time for ballot transmission, we are also interested in simplifying the absentee voting process from the point of view of the voter. Since over 80 percent of the service community votes absentee, we are particularly interested in eliminating notarization requirements on the federal post card application. They are a major impediment to some overseas



voters. (See enclosed New York Times article.)

I am writing to ask you to introduce and/or support the necessary reform legislation in your state. Upon request, we can provide specific proposals. There are currently eight states that count absentee ballots arriving up to ten days after the election. This is a possible solution to those states with late primaries that cannot be moved. Every serviceman and dependent needs to know that they can count on a minimum of 35 days for the mail out and return of their ballot.

We recognize that these adjustments may create some inconvenience for state and local election officials. Surely, the necessary adjustments are small in comparison to the importance of making voting rights more than an empty promise to our military personnel overseas. After all, were it not for the sacrifices of military personnel, now and in the past, none of us would have the opportunity to vote in free elections.

Very respectfully,

WALTER W. KRUEGER,  
President.

[From the Dallas Times Herald, Nov. 13, 1983]

#### FIGHT WAGED TO GUARANTEE THE RIGHT TO VOTE

(By Jody Powell)

WASHINGTON.—When my home state of Georgia became the first in the nation to give 18-year-olds the right to vote, the rallying cry was, "Old enough to fight, old enough to vote." That was during World War II. Forty years later, 18-year-olds can vote in every state of the Union—except for the young people who are most likely to be doing the fighting, those in the armed forces.

States election laws in most of the 50 states can, and do, deprive many Americans who are serving their country of the right to help select its government. The culprit is the way absentee ballots are handled. Most states send them out so late and require them to be returned so early that voting is a practical impossibility for Americans stationed overseas—and some in this country. (That problem also affects business people, tourists, missionaries, diplomats and Peace Corps volunteers. But by far the largest group is military personnel.)

No matter how early one applies for an absentee ballot, in most states election officials do not start mailing them out until three weeks before the election. In 45 states, the marked ballot must be received by polling officials—not just postmarked—by election day.

It's not that anyone set out to disenfranchise Americans in uniform. The rules exist primarily for reasons of convenience, having to do with the date of primaries, ballot certification and petition drives for independent candidates. Nevertheless, the effect is denial of the right to vote.

According to a survey conducted by the Department of Defense, almost 10 percent of those in the armed forces—some 182,000 men and women—who tried to vote in 1980 could not do so. In fact, the number of disenfranchised Americans is probably much higher. The Pentagon survey did not include those who were unaware that their vote was never counted because it was received too late by election officials. Thousands of others may have been discouraged from even making the attempt because of past difficulties. Nor does the Pentagon figure include military dependents.

The number who wanted to vote but couldn't, through no fault of their own, may

have exceeded a quarter of a million in 1980. Presidential elections have been decided by fewer votes than that. But that is not really the point. The issue is whether those Americans who put their lives on the line to protect our political freedoms should be given a reasonable opportunity to enjoy them.

Ironically, those who are the victims of discrimination in this case also are barred from seeking redress through traditional channels. Members of the armed forces are legally prohibited from lobbying state legislatures or the Congress.

Fortunately, there is something the rest of us can do. Six states—Texas, California, Connecticut, Indiana, Maine and Tennessee—have taken steps to remove the most grievous barriers. (Georgia, which is one of the worst cases—requiring that absentee ballots not be mailed before 19 days prior to the election—also passed a reform measure; but it was vetoed because of an unrelated rider having to do with public utilities.)

That progress has come largely through the efforts of Samuel Wright, a young lawyer from Arlington, Va., who served as Voting Assistance Lawyer for the Judge Advocate of the Navy from 1977 through 1980. He is recruiting a cadre of volunteers to explain the problem to state legislators and governors and to lobby for reform. Also, he is signing up volunteers to work with local election officials to improve procedures within existing law—work that needs to be done even in states with acceptable legislation. So far, he has some 300 working in several dozen states. But more are needed.

Mr. Wright can provide advice on what changes are needed to make the process work better as well as the names of people already active in a given state. Information is also available to state and local officials through the Federal Voting Assistance Program at the Department of Defense.

With many state legislatures meeting for limited sessions early in the year, the time to start work is now. Nor could there be a more fitting time, with Veterans Day just behind us and scences of young Americans coming home to grieving families fresh in our minds. One would think that this would be a made-to-order cause for veterans' groups, who can muster considerable political clout and who must surely feel an obligation to those who now wear the uniforms they served in so proudly.

Sam Wright recognizes that the changes he seeks may mean inconvenience for state and local officials as well as some added expense to taxpayers. But, he says:

"These are small accommodations to make to facilitate the enfranchisement of young men and women who are prepared to lay down their lives in defense of our country. Were it not for the sacrifices of military personnel, now and in the past, none of us would have the opportunity to vote in free elections."

And I say "Amen to that."

[From the New York Times, Jan. 3, 1984]

#### VOTERS OUT OF U.S. HAVE DIFFICULTIES—THOSE LIVING ABROAD MUST FIND A NOTARY AND RETURN BALLOT

WASHINGTON.—An American who is away from home on Election Day must get forms notarized as many as four times to vote as an absentee, a nuisance for visitors to another state, but nearly impossible for those in a remote corner of the world.

An American from Rhode Island, for example, who is doing missionary work in Mozambique in southern Africa has many difficulties. Mozambique stretches more than 1,000 miles north of the capital, Maputo.

Four officers at the United States Embassy in the capital are authorized to act as notaries.

So a conscientious Rhode Islander in northern Mozambique would have to make four 1,000-mile trips to Maputo.

Ursula Shears, who is in charge of voting issues in Washington for a group called Democrats Abroad, said of Rhode Island's rules: "You have to take an oath when you send in the Federal post card asking for a ballot, again when you send in a State form that does the same thing, a third time when you register and a fourth time for the ballot itself."

#### 4 MILLION TO 5 MILLION ELIGIBLE

Henry Valentino, head of the Federal Voting Assistance Program, estimated that four million to five million Americans in other countries are eligible to vote, a source of support that candidates hardly tap. About two million are in the armed forces, stationed from Iceland to the South Pacific, and on ships at sea. Two and a half million to three million are civilians who have retired, or belong to service families, or have jobs that keep them away from home, or happen to be traveling on Election Day.

Many are United States citizens born in Italy, Greece, Poland, Yugoslavia and other places who have gone back to the old country, where they can live better on a Social Security pension than in America. Some are commuters from Canada and Mexico, the countries that have the most United States citizens in residence.

For most, the source of voting difficulties is back home. Four notarizations are required by only Rhode Island, but several states require two or three.

#### TIMING IS MAIN PROBLEM

Mr. Valentino said the main problem was that many states waited until 20 days before Election Day to mail out ballots and required them back by Election Day, which is not enough time to accommodate slow postal service in many parts of the world. Mr. Valentino favors a period of 40 or 45 days.

He estimated that outside the armed forces only 34 percent of those eligible who were abroad even tried to vote in 1980, compared with nearly 54 percent in the country as a whole.

American Citizens Abroad, a nonpartisan organization based in Geneva, ran a survey to find out why. Many citizens said they did not know they were eligible. Some also feared that voting might make them more likely to be asked for state taxes, since each vote in the Presidential election must be counted in a particular state.

Democrats Abroad and Republicans Abroad both arrange for voters to participate in primary elections, choosing delegates to their respective national conventions.

The Democratic delegates will have the right to vote in the convention, which chooses the candidates and drafts a platform. Democrats Abroad will elect delegates by mail and these, with officers of the group, will have five votes among the 3,933. Another group called Latin American Democrats, most of them from the Panama Canal area, will have five votes. Their delegates will be chosen by caucus on March 17.

The Republicans so chosen will have no vote at the 1984 convention.

[From USA Today, Sept. 14, 1984]

## SUB DUTY SINKS OREGON MAN'S VOTE

(By Frank Zoretich and Timothy Kenny)

SEATTLE.—A submariner's hopes of voting in the Nov. 6 presidential election have been torpedoed by Oregon's absentee ballot laws.

The problem for Michael Schenatzki, a 31-year-old Aloha, Ore., resident stationed in Bangor, Wash.: He has gone to sea aboard a nuclear-powered submarine, which can stay out to sea up to 70 days. And Oregon won't print its ballots until next month.

"It's frustrating, not being permitted to vote by absentee ballot," Schenatzki said before his departure. "This is a very important election because the viewpoints of the candidates are so different."

About 180,000 service men and women—9 percent of the USA's 2 million service men and women—couldn't vote in the last election because of problems like Schenatzki's.

But federal officials expect fewer voting problems this year for the USA's 2 million service men and women.

Washington, Georgia, Connecticut, Maine, and California now have "submarine ballots" that can be issued 90 days in advance of elections for service personnel.

## STATE RESIDENCE OF MILITARY MEMBERS, DEPENDENTS, OVERSEAS CITIZENS

State or territory	Military members' tax withheld, legal residence	Members' total State tax withheld <sup>1</sup>	Dependents <sup>2</sup>	Nonmilitary overseas citizens <sup>3</sup>
Alabama	49,299	\$12,570,695	36,974	40,229
Alaska	6,075	0	4,556	5,747
Arkansas	27,937	3,186,370	20,953	22,988
Arizona	28,882	0	21,662	28,735
California	179,418	17,211,205	134,564	258,615
Colorado	28,028	7,789,201	21,061	34,482
Connecticut	29,290	0	21,968	34,482
Delaware	6,418	2,480,942	4,814	5,747
District of Columbia	6,300	2,663,642	4,725	5,747
Florida	181,824	0	136,368	109,193
Georgia	66,597	17,773,530	49,948	57,470
Hawaii	11,349	5,857,185	8,512	11,494
Idaho	9,533	710,440	7,150	11,494
Illinois	94,327	0	70,745	126,434
Indiana	53,181	7,062,816	39,886	57,470
Iowa	26,018	6,655,564	19,514	34,482
Kansas	18,840	4,747,007	14,130	28,735
Kentucky	31,385	8,513,806	23,539	40,229
Louisiana	36,779	4,568,829	27,584	45,976
Maine	16,110	3,987,069	12,083	11,494
Maryland	39,692	12,281,860	29,769	45,976
Massachusetts	39,732	12,925,707	29,799	63,217
Michigan	92,566	0	69,425	103,446
Minnesota	32,385	3,644,310	24,289	45,976
Mississippi	28,872	3,899,627	21,654	28,735
Missouri	42,536	0	31,902	51,723
Montana	9,184	0	6,888	11,494
Nebraska	14,197	3,005,416	10,648	17,241
Nevada	9,758	0	7,319	11,494
New Hampshire	13,875	0	10,406	11,494
New Jersey	54,247	6,462,861	40,685	80,458
New Mexico	17,117	1,657,162	12,838	17,241
New York	137,843	24,536,059	103,382	195,398
North Carolina	65,783	26,426,788	49,337	63,217
North Dakota	6,886	0	5,165	5,747
Ohio	111,151	12,459,166	83,363	120,687
Oklahoma	24,896	4,164,259	18,672	34,482
Oregon	27,416	5,868,993	20,562	28,735
Pennsylvania	94,445	2,186,359	70,834	132,181
Rhode Island	8,296	2,386,918	6,222	11,494
South Carolina	41,236	15,743,371	30,927	34,482
South Dakota	9,209	0	6,907	5,747
Tennessee	57,381	0	43,036	51,723
Texas	210,509	0	157,882	155,169
Utah	8,013	2,363,602	6,010	17,241
Vermont	6,939	0	5,204	5,747
Virginia	59,315	23,667,888	44,486	57,470
Virgin Islands	370	0	278	365
Washington	53,650	0	40,238	45,976
West Virginia	20,540	0	15,405	22,988
Wisconsin	35,313	9,618,392	26,485	51,723
Wyoming	4,825	0	3,619	5,747
Guam	3,038	0	2,279	2,885
Puerto Rico	4,812	0	3,609	5,550
Foreign	15,786	0	11,840	15,200
Trust Territories	164	0	123	154
Samoa	480	0	360	365
Non-designated	10,028	0	7,521	8,550
Total	2,320,075	279,075,039	1,740,104	2,538,761

<sup>1</sup> Tax withheld is for military members only.<sup>2</sup> Dependents—Military members multiplied by .75.<sup>3</sup> Overseas citizens—Derived by multiplying factor 5747 by number of state congressional representative.

## THE LEGACY OF WALTER HARRISON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FOWLER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, today the Georgia delegation joins together to celebrate the memory of one of our State's most dynamic leaders for over 60 years, Walter W. Harrison, of Millen. Born on September 30, 1899, Walter Harrison would have celebrated his 86th birthday yesterday. During his life, Mr. Harrison served as a catalyst for measures to improve the lives of rural people, and in public life had a record of service few have equaled. It is with a great sense of personal loss that we come together to mourn his passing, but in remembering his life we renew our dedication to the principles of public service for which he was so well known.

Around Millen, a lot of folks had a saying, "If you want a job done, get Walter Harrison on it." That only half-joking remark captured the essence of his drive to accomplish tasks that seemed beyond the reach of normal men and women. To someone growing up in Jenkins County or in another rural area of Georgia, it was hard to imagine that your farm might one day have electric light, or a telephone, or a mighty dam might be built on a nearby river, or that a marketing association might be formed to help you get better prices for your produce. Those and many other unthinkable things became a reality through the work of the man we remember today, "Uncle Walter."

Walter Harrison was an orphan who was raised by Miss Essie Harrison and lived almost all of his life in Millen, GA. Miss Essie owned a dress shop there and was one of the old style, great Southern ladies. She instilled in Walter the two characteristics for which he was best known, his faith in God and his dedication to improving the lives of others. While Uncle Walter never married, he fulfilled his longing for family by taking everyone in Millen as his own. They became his family and his love for them was as strong as any father's for his children.

Today, if you were to walk around Millen and ask about Walter Harrison, you would hear people say, "Uncle Walter helped me go to ABAC," the local college, or "he paid my way through secretarial school." Helping people better themselves is part of the legacy of Walter Harrison and in doing so he never sang his own deeds. It was always quietly done.

To those of us in public office, his record of service is enviable. For 20

years he served as mayor of Millen, 2 years as councilman, 6 years as county commissioner, 8 years in the Georgia State Senate and 12 years in the State house of representatives. But that was not enough to keep Uncle Walter busy.

He was a leader in efforts to establish and maintain a rural electric program after he joined the Planters EMC board of directors on September 14, 1937. He was in the forefront of the pioneering group who signed up co-op members at the start, and led the co-op as president of the board during the critical startup years from 1939 to 1950. In total, he served on the board for over 47 years, 18 as president. As an early leader in statewide REA organization, he was vice president of the Georgia statewide organization from 1942 to 1944, president from 1944 to 1947, and general manager from 1950 to 1974. During this time he became a director on the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association Board for 31 years, its president in 1959-60, and upon retirement was named "Board Member Emeritus." Still this was not enough to keep Walter Harrison busy.

He was a pioneer in the formation of the Planters Rural Telephone Cooperative in 1950, the first of four to be organized in Georgia. In 1974, he played a prominent role in forming Oglethorpe Power Corp., a generation and transmission cooperative supplying power to 39 Georgia electric cooperatives. He was a veteran of World War I, a member of Millen United Methodist Church for 62 years, was active in the chamber of commerce and the Rotary Club which was world renowned for its consecutive 100 percent attendance during the time he was president. He was the owner and publisher of the Millen News, active in water project development in the Central Savannah River Area which helped bring Federal power to electric cooperatives at tremendous savings, was inducted this year in the Cooperative League's Hall of Fame and most recently, was officially designated "Mr. Rural Electrification in Georgia" by Governor Joe Frank Harris.

These deeds and achievements are only a part of the rich legacy Walter Harrison has left us. His life will be recorded not only in the history books but in our hearts as well.

I include several articles on Mr. Harrison for your perusal.

The articles follow:

[From Rural Electrification, September 1985]

## "UNCLE WALTER'S" LEGACY

(By Bob Bergland, Executive Vice President and General Manager)

When Walter Harrison died the morning of August 3, he left a rich legacy of more than 48 years as a leader in this program, and more than a half-century of tireless



effort to improve the quality of life for all rural Americans. His life, which lasted a month shy of 86 years, was a celebration of success.

I had known "Uncle Walter," as so many of his friends and admirers called him, by reputation long before I met him. He was a legend and an institution. A walk with him through downtown Atlanta was like going to a family reunion. Everyone seemed to know the man from Millen, whose work in rural electrification, soil conservation, the Methodist Church and a variety of other civic causes had touched the lives of people in so many communities.

Only 1 percent of the farms in Georgia were electrified when Walter spearheaded the organization of Planters EMC, his home co-op, where he served on the board for 47 years. He helped to organize Georgia statewide and served as its manager for 25 years. In 1947, Walter was elected to NRECA's board of directors, rose to the presidency in 1960 and was re-elected to that position the following year. He represented Georgia on the NRECA board until 1979, when he left by choice and was succeeded by Hubert Hancock. But the board installed him as "director emeritus," and he served in that capacity until he passed away.

Walter was one of the most gifted public speakers I have ever heard. He had all the talents and attributes necessary to carry him to the heights of politics, which he loved. He served as the mayor of his hometown for many years, as well as 20 years in the Georgia legislature, 12 in the House of Representatives and eight in the Senate. I can't help but think that politicians in Georgia must have been constantly looking over their shoulders, wondering if and when Walter would run for governor.

A few years ago, the state of Georgia selected a few of its most prominent citizens for filming what it called its "Great Georgian" series. Walter Harrison was one of those.

Around NRECA and elsewhere, stories of Walter Harrison are legion. Typical is one from the 1975 NRECA annual meeting in New Orleans which demonstrates his ability to rise to a chance occasion. It was Tuesday, and the general session program had reached the high point of the morning—a panel discussion on the nation's energy problems. As the group prepared to go on stage, the key panelist was missing. Frantic checking yielded the knowledge that he was somewhere enroute from the airport, his arrival would be delayed by 15 or 20 minutes. What to do? With lunchtime approaching, how could the audience be held?

The answer was to call on Walter Harrison. As those who were there fondly remember, Walter strode to the podium and at his eloquent best quieted the crowd with a speech that sounded as if he had worked on it for days. A humorous footnote to this incident, I'm told, is that at one point Walter thought that the man had arrived and began to end his speech, only to be told, "Go on! Go on!" and he picked it right up without missing a beat.

There were two events that Walter wanted to participate in before he died. One was the 50th anniversary of REA celebration at Warm Springs last May, and the other was the dedication of the Richard B. Russell Dam, formerly known as Trotters Shoals. That dedication will take place this month. He worked for more than a decade to get that project on the Savannah River authorized. Its power will mean a great deal to the co-ops of Georgia and states in that power marketing area.

Walter Harrison never quit fighting and working for the rural electrification program and the people in rural America. That is his legacy.

#### GEORGIA LEADER DIES

Walter Harrison died, Saturday, Aug. 3 at his home here. He was born in Millen on Sept. 30, 1899.

At the time of his death, he was serving as director emeritus on NRECA's board, the only person to have held that title. He served two terms as president of NRECA. He led in the establishment of local, state and national rural electric programs, serving on the board of Planters EMC, Millen, for 47 years.

He served as Mayor of Millen for 20 years, editor of the Millen News for 30 years, county commissioner for eight years, state representative for 12 years and state senator for eight years.

He played a major role in marshaling the rural electric forces of three states in behalf of Federal development of the Savannah River. He was especially effective in obtaining authorization and funding for the Richard Russell Dam and Lake at Trotters Shoals, which will be dedicated at ceremonies Sept. 7.

He helped organize the Georgia statewide rural electric organization and served as its general manager for 25 years. He founded the Rural Electric Minuteman program in 1959, which resulted in the organization of citizens groups throughout the United States and the establishment of the RE Newsletter to keep them informed.

He was inducted into the Cooperative League's Hall of Fame on April 30. Governor Joe Frank Harris of Georgia officially designated him, "Mr. Rural Electrification in Georgia."

Famed as an orator, Harrison was a popular speaker before rural electric audiences and Methodist Church groups.

Sparing with "ratepayers' money," Harrison nevertheless was often a persuasive spokesman on the NRECA board and at annual meetings in getting financial support for strong information, legislative and rural development programs.

A cheerful and forgiving man, expansive of gesture and fluid of speech, he would make his drop-ins brief and end them with a hand salute: "You're a great American," he would say, and be off.

The Wednesday before his death, he was taken on a stretcher to the dedication of the "Walter Harrison Exhibit Room" of the old Freight Depot Museum in Millen, where, it was said, he made a great speech.

[From the Millen News, Aug. 8, 1985]

WALTER WADE HARRISON—1899-1985

Walter W. Harrison, 85, editor of the Millen News since 1946, died at his residence early Saturday morning August 3, after a short illness. He was a native and lifelong resident of Jenkins County.

He was active in the Rural Electrification Program and was the leader in the establishment of the Planters Electric Membership Corporation in Jenkins County in 1937. He was a member in the forefront of the Pioneering Group who signed up co-op members at the start. He led the co-op as president of the board during the critical start-up years from 1939 to 1950. He served as a member of the board for 47 years and as president 18 of those years.

He was a pioneer in the formation of the Rural Telephone Cooperative and sponsored the Rural Telephone Act in the Geor-

gia Senate in 1950. He served as president of the Rural Telephone Cooperative in Jenkins County for four years.

He was active in related organizations which included all segments of the electrical industry. He served as chairman of the Farm Electrification Council. He was active in the Georgia Electric Membership Cooperation and he served as president from 1950 to 1975. He was currently serving on the Georgia Electric Membership Cooperation Board representing his local co-op. He served for 31 years as a member of the board of directors of NRECA, and was president for two years and at the time of death was a board member emeritus, the only person to hold such a position in the NRECA.

In the political area in Jenkins County he served 20 years as mayor of Millen, two years as councilman, six years as county commissioner, eight years as a member of the Georgia State Senate and 12 years as a member of the House of Representatives.

He promoted the dairy industry in Jenkins County and was instrumental in the formation of the Ogeechee Valley Cheese Plant which helped expand the dairy industry to the position of one of the largest dairy counties in the state.

He was not only interested in promoting the economic position of his home county but was one of the founders of the Central Savannah River Area Planning and Development Commission which served 13 counties in southeast Georgia. He served as president of the commission and at the time of his death was still a longtime member of the board of directors.

Another accomplishment of which Mr. Harrison was most proud was his involvement in the chartering of the Ogeechee Valley Bank. He had served as the Chairman of the Board of Directors since its beginning and held this position at the time of his death.

He was also instrumental in bringing the public and private Electric Utility Leadership into a closer working relationship thus promoting general use of electricity throughout the nation. He was honored in 1975 with the Silver Switch Award in appreciation of his work in the field of Rural Electrification. He also received a Certificate of Appreciation from REA in Washington along with a Distinguished Service Award from NRECA and was the first director of the organization to be so recognized.

Because of his general interest in rural development and especially agri-business, he was awarded the "Distinguished Agri-Business Award" from the Georgia Agri-Business Council. He also received a plaque in recognition of his services to the Oglethorpe Power Cooperation, the wholesale supplier of electricity in 39 rural cooperatives in Georgia.

He was a member of the Millen United Methodist Church for 62 years and was still on the administrative council and up to the time of his illness taught the Sunday school class. He was an active member of the Millen Rotary club of which he served as president and a member of the board of directors for many years.

In addition to his many accomplishments, Mr. Harrison devoted his entire life to those things that would make his hometown a better place to live.

His most recent award was from the board of directors of the Cooperative League of the USA when he was inducted into the Cooperative Hall of Fame which was established in 1974 and is maintained by the Co-

operative League to honor those whose life-long contributions to the Cooperatives have been truly heroic. He received this award on April 3.

Another recent award was made to Mr. Harrison during the 50th Anniversary celebration of the Rural Electrification program held at the Little White House in Warm Springs, Georgia, on May 11th of this year. At this time Governor Joe Frank Harris presented Mr. Harrison with a plaque proclaiming him as "Mr. Rural Electrification of Georgia". The last honor bestowed upon Mr. Harrison was on July 20th, when the Jenkins County Historical Association dedicated the exhibit hall at the Olde Freight Depot Museum as "The Harrison Room."

An indication of the high esteem in which Mr. Harrison was held was the overflow crowd at the Millen United Methodist Church for his funeral. The church was filled not only with local residents, but a host of people who traveled long distances, from throughout the nation and state to pay their last respects to Walter Harrison.

The funeral services were held at the Millen United Methodist Church at 2 p.m. on Monday with the Reverend Charles Conway and the Reverend Clyde Harvard officiating. His body lay in state at the church for two hours prior to the funeral services. Burial was in the Millen Cemetery.

Palbearers were Bob Tanner, Joe Tanner, G. B. Sasser, Gordon Sasser, Ellis Lovett, and Frank Edenfield.

[From the Savannah Morning News]

WALTER W. HARRISON

Light and enlightenment were the chief commodities Walter W. Harrison had to offer his friends and neighbors in Jenkins County. His death at age 85 in Millen Saturday prompted recollections of his yeoman service.

As editor of The Millen News, he enlightened through his weekly newspaper. But he was not content to remain the county sage and merely report on the passing parade in his corner of the world. Whenever he saw a need, he made things happen to fulfill that need.

He thus was an activist as well as an editor. He took the lead in rural electrification, and helped to establish one of the first of Georgia's many cooperatives that would cause the electric light to supplant the kerosene lamp and in other ways improve with electrical energy the quality of life in rural areas.

Similarly, Mr. Harrison led the way for a telephone cooperative. He was in the forefront of movements to improve dairy farming and other agricultural activities. He used his newspaper to promote such progress, and he broadened his leadership by taking active roles on Millen's council as mayor and as an alderman, on the Jenkins County Commission, and in the General Assembly. Not much went on in Millen and environs that didn't involve Mr. Harrison.

Walter Harrison many times was recognized publicly for his leadership. His death affords a final opportunity to express gratitude to one who gave service above and beyond the call of duty to so many and in so many different ways.

□ 1950

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from the First Congressional District of Georgia [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to join with the many friends of Walter Harrison in this tribute. This is a very special time for me because Mr. Harrison was a resident of Millen, GA, in my congressional district, and he was a wonderful friend and a trusted counselor to me for a number of years.

The death of Colonel Harrison, as many of us called him, was an event that means many things to me personally.

On one hand, it marked the loss of a light of leadership that we had all come to depend on for decades. It was a sad and tragic loss for our State and our Nation.

But from another perspective, his passing has led me and many others to reflect on, and celebrate, the joy that comes from the life of a man who gave much more than he took. That is the heart and soul of Walter Harrison—a man who dedicated himself to public service in the highest and finest sense of the word.

I often dropped by to visit Mr. Harrison in his office at the Millen News, the paper that he loved and edited for years. His desk was always cluttered with the materials of his latest projects and latest battles, and his walls were covered with the awards and tributes of past accomplishments.

In the space of a few moments, Mr. Harrison would make you at home with his booming and resonant voice of welcome, have you in a chair, and launch into questions and statements about issues ranging from outer space to historic renovation. He had that special spark of enthusiasm that even at age 85 allowed him to take a listener and transform that person into a partner—a partner in his latest project for the public good.

I left the House floor just a few months ago to go downtown here in Washington to celebrate with Colonel Harrison when he was inducted into the Cooperative League of the USA Hall of Fame in recognition of his work in behalf of rural electrification. I drove to his home in Millen this past May to visit with him during his illness, and he was a man facing that illness with characteristic courage. He turned aside questions about his physical condition and instead was full of questions and comments of his own about the many issues in which he was still involved.

The work of Colonel Harrison in regard to electric power is legendary, and the public record of his life will show that he was the pioneer who had the insight and skill to make the dream of universal electric service a reality in my State.

It is hard to imagine a Georgia or an America today that was ever without electricity, and yet that was just the situation for most of the land area of

my State at about the time of my birth. It took men like Walter Harrison to recognize that affordable electric power was the foundation of any effort to pull rural America from economic stagnation, and it took men like Walter Harrison to turn what was a dream into a reality.

I will not dwell on Mr. Harrison's accomplishments regarding rural electrification because that is well established in the public record. But we should take special note that he had the vision to select the great issue of his day as the goal of his professional life, and we should remember that he developed a remarkable array of skills to accomplish his goal.

I say that because Colonel Harrison was a man who combined the toughness of a drill sergeant with the speaking skills of a great preacher, and a heart as big as the Nation he loved. He was a soft touch for anyone in need, and he responded to every appeal for assistance with a worthy cause.

For any normal man, Colonel Harrison's work with rural electrification would have left no time for other affairs, but that was not his nature. He was a tireless servant to the public and was elected to just about every office he ever cared to hold, from councilman and mayor to State senator. He was a renaissance man of rural America.

Mr. Speaker, with the death of Walter Harrison, our Nation has lost a dynamic leader, and I have lost a treasured friend.

Our tributes to him are from our hearts, but no matter what words of honor we may speak, none can do him greater tribute than the monuments of accomplishment that he fashioned with his own deeds. We take comfort in the fact that his accomplishments will stand strong and tall long after we in this Chamber are gone.

It was a privilege for me to know Walter Harrison. It was an honor to count him as a friend. He brought the light of electric power to generations of Americans, but more importantly, he taught us that the light within ourselves is more powerful than any obstacle to a worthwhile goal.

May God bless that great man and may God comfort his family and hometown friends.

I would like to conclude my remarks by inserting into the RECORD the comments of a man who knew and loved Walter Harrison for many, many years. He is Mr. Frank Edenfield, the publisher of the Millen News a man with great insight into his beloved city of Millen and rural Georgia. The following editorial, which was published in the Millen newspaper on August 15 of this year, is the finest testament I have seen to one of the finest men I have ever known:



[From the Millen News, Aug. 15, 1985]

WALTER HARRISON AS I KNEW HIM

(By Frank M. Edenfield)

On Saturday morning, August 3rd 1985, I lost a lifetime friend with the death of Walter Harrison. In addition to being a friend, Walter and I had been partners in the Millen News for nearly forty years, he serving as Editor and I, as Publisher. Needless to say this was a shock to me, even though Walter had lived to the ripe old age of eighty-five.

As is sometimes the case in these kind of circumstances, when the initial shock has worn away your mind begins to wander and reminisce. This is exactly what happened to me.

The thought came to me that most of Walter's achievements on the State and National level had been chronicled in the press of the state and nation. However, little, was said about the impact that his life had on this community other than to state that he had devoted his entire life to serving.

As I began reminiscing I made a memory trip through Millen trying to recall those things which Walter had participated in which made a large contribution to the progress of this community. I began jotting down those things which I could remember, and I realize the list is far from being complete, however, I would like to share with you some of the things which I remembered about Walter Harrison. These events are not in chronological order nor are they remembered in the magnitude of their importance.

My starting place was down Cotton Avenue and I immediately came upon The Olde Freight Depot Museum which would not be in existence today had it not been for Walter. Then as I approached the Chamber of Commerce office I recalled that Walter had been the first Secretary of the Jenkins County Chamber of Commerce when he was a young man, serving for years with no pay. Across the street was the Pal Theater which he had struggled to keep in existence for years believing it was a focal point for the youth of our community for entertainment.

As I passed the railroad station I could not help but remember the fact that Walter had been an express agent for the railroad and that throughout the years he had done battle with the railroad each time they sought to discontinue a passenger train that served Millen and this area of the state. The railroad won this battle but Walter prolonged the victory.

Then as I turned on South Gray Street, I saw the recreation facility just beyond Edenfield Feed and Seed store and remember that it was Walter who first secured a lease from the Central of Georgia Railway for this property to be used for recreational purposes. I could not help but remember the many football and baseball games which youth of our community have played on this field and the construction of a grandstand in order that Millen might compete in the long forgotten Million Dollar League and later the Georgia-Carolina baseball league. This site was also used as the location for the annual Jenkins County Fair which was held for many years.

Continuing South on Gray Street, I passed the Bethany Home and recalled the part Walter played in getting Dr. Cleveland Thompson to sell his hospital to the Bethany Home interest for the establishment of their facilities here. I rode through the Myers Hill section of our community and remembered that the first development in this section was brought about through the

efforts of Walter Harrison and Wiley Wasden. Walter's foresight in placing city utilities was the beginning of the development for this section of the city.

Then as I rode by the modern recreation complex I could not help but remember that the land upon which this facility is situated was first bought by Walter Harrison and then sold to the city at no profit to be used for the purpose that it is now being put to.

As I drove on Highway 25 I could not help but recall his efforts in cooperation with another pioneer citizen of our community, Ernest Daniel, in securing the bridge across the Ogeechee River. Also, he was largely responsible for the securing of improvements on Highway 25 which included the overpass.

Continuing on up Highway 25 I turned west on Highway 17 and recalled the part Walter played in establishing the development of Lincoln Park in its beginning and also his efforts in the development of the Foggy Field area.

As I rode past Thomson Company I remembered that Walter, almost single handed, was responsible for establishing this industry in Millen which has resulted in the employment of hundreds throughout the years and has made such a tremendous contribution to the economic security of our community.

As I rode along the northern city limits of Millen I saw the magnificent building which houses Jockey International and could not help but recall the part Walter played in securing this industry which was originally housed on Daniel Street in a remodeled cotton warehouse and then the expansion in that area to cover almost a block before the move to its present location.

As I rode by the Millen Community House I remembered as a young teenager going to school when this site was often a big pond during the rainy season and that Walter had the foresight to use WPA labor to have it drained and filled in and later taking advantage of WPA labor for the construction of the beautiful Community House.

As I passed the Millen United Methodist Church I remember how unselfishly Walter had given of his time and talents and probably his finances to bring about many of the improvements to his church.

Youth, Inc. was another of his dreams. He believed the youth of the community needed a center for good clean recreation and convinced a number of other local citizens who had the same desire to join him in building this building and developing the facilities there.

Another dream of Walter's which became a reality was the establishment of the Ogeechee Valley Cheese Plant as a means of providing additional income for the hard pressed farmers of our area. The cheese plant failed but in so doing it marked the beginning of the gigantic dairy industry for Jenkins County.

I remember the part he played in first influencing the owners and managers of Brigadier Industries to bring their mobile home plant to Millen which has grown into one of the major industries located in our community. Also, the part he played in bringing Ravenwood, a manufacturer of furniture, to Millen. This too failed but it was most beneficial to the community while it was in existence.

While Walter was not directly involved in the movement of Look Products, which later became known as Rusco Industries, to Millen, he was one of its biggest supporters and assisted them in every possible way since their move to Millen.

Walter was also the father of the development in the Knox Homes section of our community. He did this by convincing the Knox Brothers of Thomson, Georgia, to develop the area and sell the homes to local citizens on a long term, low interest, rate plan.

The three housing projects which are now in existence in Millen are also another of his ideas on which he spent many hours getting Federal Approval for the projects.

The old City Hall on Gray Street was another of Walter's accomplishments. This was built during the WPA days at little cost to the local taxpayers. I cannot help but recall his pride at having Millen's first fire truck. This was a homemade affair but at the time it was a great improvement over the fire fighting equipment being used by the City. This fire truck, by the way, is still in existence and is in the custody of the local Shrine Club.

Walter was very sentimental about the historic structures in our community, particularly the Hotel Estelle. He was largely responsible for its preservation to this date.

Another dream that he pursued and lived to see fulfilled was the chartering of the Ogeechee Valley Bank. He pursued this for many years because he firmly believed that an additional bank would tend to improve the economic condition of our city and county.

He was also at the forefront of the establishment and construction of the Jenkins County Memorial Library and the Jenkins County Health Center.

Walter firmly believed that the various communities of our county could be served better if each area had a central meeting place and he spearheaded drives in each of these communities which resulted in the building of community houses in several different sections of the county. He was saddened by the fact that most of these are no longer being used.

Another of his outstanding accomplishments was the part he played in the establishment of Magnolia Spring State Park and the Federal Fish Hatchery. This was a long term dream of Walter's which began when he was able to get a CCC camp located in the area during the depression years. This camp provided the manpower to start the development of these areas.

Another historical landmark which is still preserved today as Big Buckhead Church. This was almost a one man endeavor by Walter, however, from time to time he was able to influence others to join him in the venture.

Walter undoubtedly had a crystal ball that he consulted with from time to time, for many, many years ago when serving as Mayor of the City of Millen he was successful in getting the city fathers to purchase the land which now is being used at the Millen Cemetery. Few believed that Millen would ever need this amount of space but time has proved otherwise.

Throughout all of Walter's public life he believed that the way to expand a community was to improve its facilities and there is no way of telling how many hours, days, months or years that he spent seeking ways to pave the streets within the city and the extension of water and sewer facilities of the city into remote areas. Time has proved that he was correct because most of those remote areas are now residential areas of the city.

Another thing Walter loved was the youth of this community and there is no way of telling or knowing how many of our local

youth he has assisted in so many ways, from giving them a few dollars to spend at summer camp to helping them arrange some means of attending college to further their education. I was privileged to know some of those but Walter chose to keep them a secret and this secret died with Walter Harrison.

I believe to sum it up Walter loved first his church, then his community, the development of the Rural Electrification Program, not only in Jenkins County but throughout the State and Nation, and the Millen News.

As I drove along the city limits of Millen I could not help but observe the telephone and electric lines which extend out into the rural areas of Jenkins County, remembering that most of this would not have been accomplished without the part played by Walter Harrison.

My personal loss is more than I can put into words, because throughout the many years of association I have sought his advice and counsel on numerous occasions and I value this very much. I will not attempt to elaborate on this other than to say he had a lasting influence in my life and had it not been for the partnership which we formed some forty years ago with a handshake standing on the corner of Winthroe and Gray Streets, I am sure that I would not be in the position to write the comments that I have listed above. To say that I shall miss him would be the understatement of the century, for I shall always cherish the memories I have of him.

I hope as you read the above you will allow your mind to reminisce back through the years and remember the impact this man had on this community. I know that I have omitted many things that he was associated with but I believe this contains many of the highlights.

I guess all of the above could be summed up by a joke which I heard Lewis Grizzard, who writes a daily column for the Atlanta newspaper, use in a speech. The story goes like this "If you are a member of a dog sled team, the scenery would remain the same unless you were the lead dog". In my opinion, Walter Harrison was the "lead dog" in this community. The scenery has changed quite a bit during these years and he was responsible for much of this change.

Mr. FOWLER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. BARNARD. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to join with my distinguished colleagues from the State of Georgia in honoring Mr. Walter Harrison, affectionately known as "Mr. Rural Electrification."

Mr. Harrison nurtured the growth of rural electrification from its infancy in 1936 through the next five decades, and was instrumental in bringing electricity for the first time to rural areas in Georgia and throughout the United States.

Through Mr. Harrison's efforts, farms in our state were belatedly introduced to the 20th century, and he devoted a great deal of time to bring not only the benefits of electrical power to these areas, but the advantages of telephone communication as well.

In addition to the good works he performed on behalf of rural electrification, Mr. Harrison gave generously of his time through nearly 50 years of public service—including two decades as mayor of his

hometown of Millen, and an equal number of years in the Georgia General Assembly.

Mr. Harrison was involved on a civic level, too, in Millen and surrounding Jenkins County. From volunteering many years to his church to serving as editor of the local newspaper, he obviously was an active participant in all his endeavors.

Mr. Harrison's legacy lives on in many ways: in the educational opportunities he provided by helping young people go to college, in the good deeds he performed through many organizational boards on which he served, and especially in his tireless work on behalf of rural electrification, which has been responsible for great strides not only in Georgia but throughout our Nation. I am privileged to join in saluting him today for the many years of service he gave, from which we all continue to benefit immeasurably.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, Congressman FOWLER, for allowing me this moment to pay tribute to Walter Harrison, a man who was known throughout Georgia for his commitment to bettering the lives of the people in our State and in his community.

Walter Harrison will be remembered for his early commitment to the challenge of bringing electricity to rural Georgia. Although we take it for granted now, in 1937 electricity seemed like a dream to people in most parts of rural Georgia. Walter Harrison wanted to make that dream a reality, and he dedicated his life to pursuit of that goal.

With his help, the Planters Electric Membership Cooperative was formed and he served as the president of the board from 1939 to 1950. During those early years, when co-ops still faced uncertain futures, Walter Harrison acted as both guide and leader to put Planters EMC on solid footing.

Walter Harrison always sought to bring the fruits of progress into the rural areas. He was a pioneer in the formation of the Rural Telephone Cooperative, and sponsored the Rural Telephone Act in the Georgia Senate in 1950. He constantly sought new ways to put electricity to work on the farms of Georgia, and served as chairman of the Farm Electrification Council, as well as president of the Georgia EMC from 1950 to 1975.

Walter Harrison's mark on Georgia is one of brilliance. It continues to shine now, as it will in the future, whenever the lights go on across rural Georgia. Few men leave behind the legacy of good works and community love which Walter Harrison has, and our State will sorely miss him.

We will always need men and women with the vision to see a brighter future and the courage to reach out for that future.

Walter Harrison saw the world around him as a place that could be improved—and he devoted his life to bringing those improvements to pass. In paying tribute to him today, there is one act that I believe to be most fitting. It is now up to those who have benefited from his life to pledge to carry on his work.

If Walter Harrison's spirit of giving, service and love live on, his legacy will never die. I believe there can be no more meaningful tribute to a life generously lived than this.

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues from Georgia in expressing sorrow over the death of Mr. Walter Harrison, one of the early shapers of the rural electrification movement in this country.

As someone who grew up on a dairy farm, I can understand perhaps better than some of my urban colleagues the value of Mr. Harrison's work to bring electric power to rural America. In the depths of the Great Depression of the 1930's, rural electrification began to erase the darkness of nights in the countryside and to relieve rural people from much of the drudgery which was a necessary part of rural life for years after the lighting of our cities. Thanks to Mr. Harrison's efforts, the lives of people of my generation in Hancock County, GA, could be markedly easier and more comfortable than had been the lives of our parents.

I had the honor recently of attending dedication ceremonies for the new Richard Russell Dam, power from which will be a boon to the electric cooperatives of Georgia and surrounding State. Mr. Harrison was especially effective in obtaining authorization and funding for that dam, which was dedicated just 5 weeks after his death. It now joins the long list of monuments to his dedication and service to rural people across this country.

Mr. HATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to one of Georgia's finest leaders for the last 60 years, Mr. Walter Harrison, who passed away on August 3. Mr. Harrison, a native and lifelong resident of Jenkins County, GA, was active in the early years of the Rural Electrification Administration program in southeast Georgia.

In addition, Mr. Harrison had a distinguished political career, including eight years as a member of the State senate, 12 years as a State representative, 20 years as the mayor of Millen, GA, 2 years as a city councilman, and 6 years as a county commissioner.

Mr. Harrison's long record of public service has been the inspiration and guiding force behind many of the Georgians' lives he has touched. His dedication to his hometown and to his home State is evident in the many areas in which he worked throughout his life. His commitment to making Georgia a better place to live will be felt for many generations to come, but it is also a commitment that will be sorely missed in the state. We need more Walter Harrisons, and I humbly salute this great man whose memory will live long in the history of Georgia.

Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, many people have described Georgia's Walter Harrison as a "pioneer." It is a description which fit this Jenkins County native in every way. He was a visionary, an innovator, a bold and adventurous leader in his community and State.



No more than 1 percent of Georgia's farms had electricity when Walter Harrison established the Planters Electric Membership Corp. in 1937, supplying power to rural Burke and Jenkins counties. He went on to devote most of his life to the rural electric program on both the State and national levels. He was instrumental in establishing the Georgia Electric Membership Corp., where he served as the organization's manager for 25 years.

Walter Harrison received more awards and honors than we can recount here. But it was particularly fitting that just this year he was presented the Georgia EMC 50th anniversary Pioneer Award, was named by Gov. Joe Frank Harris as "Mr. Rural Electrification," and was inducted into the Co-operative League of the USA Hall of Fame in Washington, DC.

When he died at the age of 85 last month, the people of Georgia and the Nation lost a true friend.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

#### AIDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time this evening as a senior member of the health and Environment Subcommittee of the Energy and Commerce Committee to talk about a subject that is on the minds and hearts of many Americans today. That is the subject of AIDS; what is it, what we in Congress can be doing about it, and what we should be doing about it.

First, a few words as to what its current status is in this country.

It is a serious condition characterized by a defect in the natural immunization against disease. Hence, the name AIDS.

Since its discovery in the United States in 1981, the Public Health Service has received reports of more than 13,000 cases, over 50 percent of which have resulted in death.

Over 1 million Americans have been infected with the AIDS virus right now. It is reported that 5 to 10 percent of those that are so infected will come down with AIDS within the next 5 years. Some persons have estimated that those who will come down with AIDS in the next 5 years is closer to 25 percent. If the 25-percent figure is accurate, that means 250,000 Americans dying with AIDS within 5 years.

Currently the death rate is 80 percent 2 years after diagnosis. No AIDS patient has survived more than 3 years after diagnosis. More than 160 cases of AIDS in children are under the age of 13. AIDS can be passed on to infants in the womb or after birth. Reported incidents of AIDS have doubled each year since its discovery in 1981. Health officials anticipate over 40,000 new cases of AIDS over the next 2 years in the United States alone.

One of the crucial questions about AIDS, of course, is: Can it be transmitted by normal social contact? The answer to this question is at this point unclear. Most of the medical officials in our country say no, although they are not certain about that.

The syndrome has been reported as striking mainly male homosexuals, 72 percent, roughly, of AIDS cases. It has also affected intravenous drug users, 17.2 percent of the AIDS cases. This means that a significant number of innocent victims in no-risk groups have been afflicted by the disease, 3.6 percent Haitians, 0.6 percent hemophiliacs, 1.2 percent recipients of blood transfusions and 3.8 percent belonging to no apparent risk group. There are about 500 of these 13,000 AIDS cases today that medical science cannot really find a cause for how those persons acquired it.

There are about 2 percent, close to that, of people who were in medical need of a blood transfusion, went to a blood bank or a hospital and got a blood transfusion and ended up with AIDS, about 260 people nationwide in that category today.

The live AIDS virus has been found in blood, semen, serum, saliva, urine, and tears. There are 216 reported cases of AIDS linked to the use of blood or blood products, blood transfusions, or hemophiliacs. Research studies indicate that the median lifetime number of male sexual partners for homosexual male AIDS patients is 1,160.

Regarding treatment, the UCLA Medical Center estimates that the average AIDS patient requires 2 to 3 months of hospitalization, with 1 to 3 weeks in the intensive care unit, equaling a total cost of \$50,000 to \$100,000 per patient. At the present time there is no known cure for AIDS.

As to the magnitude of the risk to our world, listen to these words from Dr. John Seale, writing in the August issue of Britain's Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine, stating that AIDS is capable of producing a lethal pandemic throughout the crowded cities and villages of the Third World of a magnitude unparalleled in human history.

Some of these matters were brought to this Member's attention in my home State of California over the recent August break, and indeed we Californians have 25 percent of the

AIDS cases that have been so far recorded in these United States. Of those 25 percent of the cases, most of them are located in San Francisco, in Los Angeles, although some are spread out in other areas of the State of California. About 40 percent of the total cases are located in the State of New York.

Members would be interested to know that since 1982, \$407 million has been expended on AIDS research. In 1982, just 4 years ago, only \$5.6 million was appropriated for research. In 1986, just under \$200 million has been earmarked by the Federal Government, indicating a response for the need of intensive effort. I do not think there is any questions in anybody's mind in the Congress today that we will supply the funds that are requested by our public health authorities in order to hopefully find a cure for the disease, although the prospects for that have not been, up until now, entirely optimistic in terms of a forecast.

As a result of certain information that was brought to my attention last month, I wrote a letter to the Public Health Service on August 8, asking that body in this country to take some action in order to protect the integrity of the blood supply that we Americans rely upon whenever we have need for a blood transfusion. At that time, when you went to a blood bank, you were given two forms to fill out. One form contained 20 questions. One of the questions was whether or not you are an intravenous drug user. Bear in mind that category of people have contributed about 17 percent of the AIDS cases.

#### □ 2005

If you answer that question "yes" to the blood bank, the official position is you cannot donate blood.

You are also given another form, this was as of August 8 of this year, in which the blood banks listed certain persons in a "should not donate" category. In the "should not donate" category were listed polygamous male homosexuals. The inference being that if you are a monogamous male homosexual as of that date, August 8, your blood was welcome in the blood supply of the country. The rationale for that position was that the Elisa test that was begun in the early part of this year that detected any AIDS virus that may have been in the blood of a monogamous male homosexual so the blood supply was protected.

The defect in that reasoning is the fact that of those who test negative, there is a 4-percent fail rate. In other words, of those monogamous male homosexuals who are given the test, a false negative comes into existence for 4 percent of the total so their blood is getting into the blood banks of America.

My letter of request to the Public Health Service was that all male homosexuals be denied the ability to donate blood so as to protect the integrity of the blood supply of this country. I am happy to say to my colleagues that just 1 month later, September 8, CDC, speaking for the Public Health Service, adopted a regulation in which it placed monogamous male homosexuals on the same basis as polygamous male homosexuals. Namely, that they were both placed into the "should not donate" category.

The puzzling thing about this position is this: Intravenous drug users, who contribute roughly 17 percent of the cases of AIDS are in the "cannot" category. Yet male homosexuals who contribute 75 percent of the cases of AIDS are still today in the "should not donate" category. I asked Dr. Mason, head of Public Health Service, the other day in my office to put all male homosexuals in the same category as intravenous drug users on the rationale that if it is in the public interest, and I believe it is, to suggest that intravenous drug users who contribute 17 percent of the cases of AIDS are not permitted to donate blood, then I would submit that it follows that a category who contribute 75 percent of the known cases of AIDS should also be in the "cannot" category. He said he would take that into consideration.

Quite frankly, my friends, I believe that the reason that the CDC acted so promptly, promptly being 30 days from the time of my letter of August 8, was because they could not defend the position that they were taking with respect with continuing to receive into the blood banks of America the blood of those who claim to be monogamous male homosexuals. That is the reason I believe on September 8 that they wisely adopted the policy option that significantly implemented the recommendation that I asked them to make. I hope that they will have the wisdom to take the additional step of placing all male homosexuals into the "cannot" category as well to further protect the integrity of our blood supply.

I think it is time that we say to the American people that our blood supply today that any of us has recourse to utilize is contaminated with a modest quantity of AIDS virus. Any of us bear a small statistical chance of getting AIDS if we take a blood supply today from a hospital or a blood bank or what have you. The public health authorities are faced with a very delicate choice: If we had a perfect world, we would throw out all of the supplies of blood in the blood banks of America today. But if we did that, those who depend on that blood and plasma for life-giving sustenance would be denied the receipt of that needed commodity. The judgment call has been made that those who would be denied the blood

from the blood banks would be far greater in number than those who statistically are going to get AIDS from continuing to receive blood from the blood supply of this country. I think probably that is a sound judgment.

What should we do? Those of us in this country, when faced with the problem of needing a blood transfusion? We should encourage the blood banks, the hospitals of this country to set up direct donation of blood, so that when our loved ones have a need for a blood transfusion, we can, within the framework of our family units and our close loved ones, receive the blood that we need. This reduces the chance, significantly, of any recipient of blood innocently receiving AIDS.

In some places of the country this is followed today. Not everywhere, but in some places. I believe it is one policy option that our public health authorities should be diligently pursuing in order to protect the integrity of the blood supply of this country and the health of the people of America.

A good question comes into existence, and that is why it took a letter from a Member of Congress on August 8 to cause CDC to change its policy with respect to who cannot or should not be donating blood. Up until that point, CDC had made a judgment balancing competing interests. On the one hand, protecting the integrity of the blood supply of the country; on the other hand, protecting the sensitivity of the male homosexual community of America.

As of August 8, when I wrote that letter, they had come down on the side of protecting the integrity of the sensitivity of the male homosexual community of America, and to that extent, I believe that they made a serious error of judgment. To a large extent, they have corrected that error of judgment, and I think they should be commended for the step that they have taken.

I think today in this country it is time our public health authorities recognize the epidemic that is going on and pursue certain policy options that when this balance effect has to take place, will come down on the side of protecting the integrity and the health and the public at large and be less concerned for protecting the sensitivity of these tragic AIDS victims for whom we can have nothing but compassion, and I certainly do, because they are going to die. There is no cure for it at this time.

But those of us in public life are called upon to make choices, some of them hard. In this instance I think the choice of protecting the public health must take precedence over the sensitivities of that group in our culture which has contributed the largest percentage of these AIDS cases; namely male homosexuals.

In this spirit, I wrote the letter that I did to the head of the Public Health Service. As a result of the controversy that developed in California in mid-August over this issue, a lawyer from San Francisco called me on the phone and brought to my attention a case he was handling for four nurses working in the San Francisco General Hospital. General practitioner nurses.

He told me a tale that is very difficult to believe upon hearing. What he said was this: San Francisco General Hospital adopted a policy that said to the nurses, "When you are treating victims of AIDS in this hospital, you may not wear gowns, masks, and gloves because when you do that you impinge on the sensitivity of the AIDS patients in the hospital." Bear in mind that all other health practitioners in that hospital treating AIDS patients wore gowns, masks, and gloves such as dentists, doctors, x-ray technicians, dietitians, maintenance workers; anybody else going into those rooms.

These nurses made a legitimate claim of discrimination, and so they brought their case to California OSHA in Sacramento.

□ 2015

OSHA sent an investigator to look into this matter and a couple weeks ago made an interesting decision. It said that the nurses were right, that they should be permitted to wear gowns, masks, and gloves in treating these AIDS patients so long as other health practitioners were permitted to do the same; but then they went on, OSHA did, to enter an interesting little footnote to their decision. They said, "Nurses, you may wear gowns, masks, and gloves, except in those cases where the doctors treating the AIDS patients notate otherwise on the charts."

A day after this decision by OSHA, the doctors treating AIDS patients went around one by one and made notations on the charts stating that the nurses were not to wear gowns, masks, and gloves, in treating those AIDS patients.

When you hear discrimination of that type, you wonder what in the world is going on. I will tell you what is going on. That hospital has an administration consisting of a majority of male homosexuals. They are running the facility in a way that exhibits the bias I have described.

I think it is intolerable, it is insufferable that such a condition would be permitted to exist and I believe that we in the Congress, having control and responsibility for disbursing Federal funds to hospitals all over America, should be saying to any hospital receiving Federal funds, "You may not discriminate in respect to health care of workers in your facilities."



I believe at this point it is necessary that we in Congress consider what policy options are available to us and I have sent out a "Dear Colleague" letter to the Members of this House and I want to describe what those policy options would be right now.

The first bill would make it a felony for a person in a high-risk group to knowingly donate blood. The CDC defines a high-risk group as those with AIDS, intravenous drug users, hemophiliacs, those receiving transfusions within the previous year, or males who have had sex with another male since 1977.

This is to give teeth to the Public Health Service guidelines with a criminal penalty. It is no different than when you go down to a bank and seek a loan from your banker. You list your assets and liabilities and on the bottom you sign that the statements you have made are correct and accurate, and in some cases you sign under penalty of perjury. Most of us correctly state our condition, but if we do not, the system provides a means for going after those who deliberately misrepresent their status.

Strange and weird as it may sound, my office has received unconfirmed reports, which are difficult to check out, that certain male homosexuals in this country are so incensed and frustrated that America has not found a solution to the AIDS crisis to cure them of this disease that they have in a spirit of spite threatened to donate blood, those with AIDS, in order to contaminate the blood supply, hoping to reach the heterosexual world so as to increase the level of attention that we of the heterosexual world, the 95 percent of us in this country, may be willing to devote to this tragic disease.

To those who may have the inclination, let me observe that we in the Congress will appropriate what is necessary, called upon by the public health authorities for research funds to hopefully find a cure for this tragic disease. We do not need threats of that nature. Threats of that nature will not add anything to the solution, but I think this law that I am talking about is necessary so that if we do have people who conduct themselves in that way that we have the means to bring them to justice for their excesses.

The second bill forbids discrimination against nurses and health care practitioners from using protective garments in treating AIDS patients.

I previously described to the Members what was encountered in the San Francisco General Hospital and the rationale as to why we should adopt that regulation.

I am advised that tomorrow the House is scheduled to take up the appropriation bill for HHS. This Member will attempt to offer an amendment to that bill so as to make clear that we

will not tolerate the discrimination that we have encountered, as I have described, in the city and county of San Francisco at the San Francisco General Hospital.

The Members know very well that the rules of this House have been so structured that it is very difficult to offer such an amendment because you have to keep the committee from rising in order to be able to offer your amendment. That is done as a means of preventing accountability for the Members of this House as to our actions.

To my Democratic colleagues who run this place, I would suggest that here is another instance where your crushing of the rules, compressing the rules, has prevented some of us from offering an opportunity that we otherwise would like to pursue.

The third bill would prohibit those persons with AIDS from practicing in the health care industry. Common sense dictates that a doctor, nurse, dietitian or technician with AIDS should not come into contact with other individuals in a medical setting.

The fourth bill addresses halting the transmission of AIDS through sexual contact. This bill would provide that any city throughout the United States which fails to shut down its bath houses will be denied Federal funds. The medical community is in full agreement that AIDS is transmitted through promiscuous homosexual contact which flourishes at these facilities. Any public health officer in a city with a bath house that is frequented by male homosexuals today should exercise their judgment under the law and take action to remove that menace to the public health, just as we remove public houses of prostitution in most States of the Union on the grounds that we stop the spread of disease and we also respect the public morals of the community.

The fifth bill concerns the school attendance of students with AIDS. I believe such schoolchildren should be prohibited from attending school. Although CDC has promulgated contrary guidelines, I believe they are inadequate to deal with the special circumstances attendant upon the classroom situation. Children come into close contact with one another during the course of the schoolday and cannot be expected to shoulder the burden of taking necessary precautions in dealing with another AIDS child.

I would commend to the reading of my colleagues an article that was written by Norman Podhoretz, dated October 1, at least that is the date that I saw it, in a publication in the Salt Lake City Tribune, distributed by the News America Syndicate. It raises a very interesting series of questions about this whole problem of AIDS. It begins in the article as to accountabil-

ity from where it has come from. This is a quotation from that article:

Yet while there has been a good deal of revulsion felt and expressed in private, the public response has been a meek acceptance of the idea propagated by homosexual activists that it is the rest of us who are responsible for the existence and spread of this horrible disease.

From the idea that the rest of us are to blame, it follows that we must give "top priority" to halting the spread of AIDS. This, in fact, is what the Reagan administration, speaking through the president himself, has agreed to do.

Then Mr. Podhoretz goes ahead and describes how the AIDS virus is transmitted and what people must do in order to decrease the spread of the disease.

Dr. James O. Mason, director of the National Centers for Disease Control in Atlanta, flatly stated that no new drug or vaccine is needed to halt the spread of AIDS. "We could stop transmission of this disease today," he said, if only homosexuals (and intravenous drug users—but they are another story) were willing to observe certain precautions.

In speaking of these precautions, however, the media, with one or two exceptions like the New York Post, have, as Newsweek puts it, surrendered to "a squeamish lack of specificity." Reporters have used vague phrases like "exchange of bodily fluids" or "intimate sexual contact," and they have rarely pointed to "the correlation between AIDS and extreme promiscuity."

Curious, is it not, that in an age of ubiquitous pornography and blunt speech, it should be so hard to say in plain English that AIDS is almost entirely a disease caught by men who bugger and are buggered by dozens or even hundreds of other men every year?

For those of us who wonder how it is being spread in America, it is just that. God intended a plan for men and women of this world in the sexual arena whereby one man and one woman come together as a family unit and from that family unit children come into the world and propagate the race.

God's plan for man was Adam and Eve, not Adam and Steve, and when a human male penis is inserted into the anus of another male and sperm for the donor ends up in the anus of the recipient, there is every reason to believe this is the means by which AIDS is spread, because the lining of the anus is so structured as to not to be able to resist to prevent the sperm from entering into the bloodstream of the recipient. That interaction of the sperm into the bloodstream of the recipient is the cause of why most people, or a lot of people say AIDS has developed in our culture.

We in Congress cannot pass a law dealing with the morality and the sexual mores of our people. That is beyond our reach. It is none of the business of the Federal Government or the State government or any government in America what two people, man or woman, do in the privacy of

their own homes; but when these activities take place in public chambers, such as bath houses currently in existence in different places in America, so as to permit the transmission of a disease which is known to be transmitted by sexual contact, some of us in public life must speak up to say where perhaps we have misplaced our emphasis in terms of what we should be doing.

We live in a permissive hedonistic world in America and this AIDS epidemic is a means whereby perhaps our attention has been drawn to the excesses that have come into our society.

It is my hope that health officers around the country will have the courage of their convictions to take on the strength of the male homosexual political community and their environs and to take action to shut down those bath houses which are known to be places where AIDS are transmitted. I am talking about places in my home State of California, like San Diego and Los Angeles and San Francisco right now.

The city council of the city of Los Angeles was so influenced by the perceived political clout of the male homosexual community that they adopted an ordinance by eight to nothing saying that persons could not discriminate against those who had AIDS.

I would like to thank my colleagues for this opportunity and as this matter progresses, I will have another opportunity to share these thoughts with my colleagues.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SLAUGHTER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 20 minutes, today.  
Mr. DANNEMEYER, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. PASHAYAN, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. SLAUGHTER, for 60 minutes, October 8.

Mr. LEACH of Iowa, for 60 minutes, October 24.

Mr. DREIER of California, for 60 minutes, October 8.

Mr. RUDD, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ECKART of Ohio) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SLATTERY, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mrs. BOGGS, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. KLECZKA, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. GAYDOS, for 30 minutes, on October 3.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SLAUGHTER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MOORHEAD.  
Mr. LEWIS of California in two instances.

Mr. MOORE.  
Ms. SNOWE.  
Mr. DANNEMEYER.  
Mr. GREGG.  
Mr. WHITEHURST.  
Mr. TAUKE.  
Mr. WOLF.  
Mr. HYDE in two instances.  
Mr. COURTER in two instances.  
Mr. GUNDERSON.  
Mr. GEKAS.  
Mr. DIOGUARDI in three instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ECKART of Ohio) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MAVROULES.  
Mr. STARK.  
Mr. RICHARDSON in two instances.  
Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut.  
Mr. BARNES.  
Mr. TRAXLER in two instances.  
Mr. MICA.  
Mr. GARCIA in two instances.  
Mr. COELHO.  
Mr. HOYER.  
Mr. PEPPER.  
Mr. FRANK.  
Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.

Mr. ACKERMAN in two instances.  
Mr. FASCELL.  
Mr. LANTOS.  
Mrs. SCHROEDER.  
Mr. MURTHA.  
Mr. FLORIO.  
Mr. WIRTH.  
Mr. RODINO.  
Mr. EDGAR.  
Mr. MARKEY in two instances.  
Mr. HUBBARD.  
Mr. BENNETT.  
Mr. LAFALCE.  
Mr. RANGEL.  
Mr. MINETA.  
Mr. TOWNS in two instances.

#### SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

A bill and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1701. An act to authorize a partial transfer of the authority of the Maine-New Hampshire Interstate Bridge Authority to the States of Maine and New Hampshire; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

S.J. Res. 189. Joint resolution designating the week beginning January 12, 1986, as "National Fetal Alcohol Syndrome Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 201. Joint resolution to designate the week beginning September 22, 1985, as

"National Needlework Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 206. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate the month of December 1985, as "Made in America Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore.

H.R. 3452. An act to extend for 45 days the application of tobacco excise taxes, trade adjustment assistance, certain medicare reimbursement provisions, and borrowing authority under the railroad-unemployment insurance program; and

H.R. 3454. An act to extend temporarily certain provisions of law.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following days present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following title:

On September 20, 1985:

H.J. Res. 128. Joint resolution designating the month of October 1985 as "National High-Tech Month"; and

H.J. Res. 299. Joint resolution recognizing the accomplishments over the past 50 years resulting from the passage of the Historic Sites Act of 1935, one of this Nation's landmark preservation laws.

On September 25, 1985:

H.R. 1042. An act to grant a Federal charter to the Pearl Harbor Survivors association;

H.J. Res. 229. Joint resolution designating the week beginning September 22, 1985, as "National Adult Day Care Center Week";

H.J. Res. 218. Joint resolution to designate the week beginning September 15, 1985, as "National Dental Hygiene Week";

H.J. Res. 394. Joint resolution reaffirming our historic solidarity with the people of Mexico following the devastating earthquake of September 19, 1985;

H.J. Res. 305. Joint resolution to recognize both Peace Corps volunteers and the Peace Corps on the Agency's 25th anniversary, 1985-86; and

H.J. Res. 287. Joint resolution to designate October 1985 as "Learning Disabilities Awareness Month."

On September 27, 1985:

H.J. Res. 388. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1986, and for other purposes.

On September 30, 1985:

H.R. 3414. An act to provide that the authority to establish and administer flexible and compressed work schedules for Federal Government employees be extended through October 31, 1985;

H.R. 3452. An act to extend for 45 days the application of tobacco excise taxes, trade adjustment assistance, certain medicare reimbursement provisions, and borrowing authority under the railroad unemployment insurance program.



On October 1, 1985:  
H.R. 3454. An act to extend temporarily certain provisions of law.

### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (as 8 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), under its previous order the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 2, 1985, at 11 a.m.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2062. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting a report on the Department of the Army's proposed Letter of Offer to the People's Republic of China for defense articles, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 133b (96 Stat. 1288); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2063. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the second report on progress of the recipients of Rental Housing Rehabilitation and Development Program grants, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1437o(n) (September 1, 1937, chapter 896, section 17(n) (97 Stat. 1206)); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

2064. A letter from the Executive Director, National Council on Educational Research, transmitting the eighth annual report, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1221e(c)(3); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2065. A letter from the Administrator, Agency for International Development, transmitting the determination that the Government of Brazil is in default of certain indebtedness, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2370(q); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2066. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting notification that the President has determined that it is necessary to reprogram an additional \$13 million for El Salvador from the fiscal year 1985 continuing resolution (Presidential Determination 85-18), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2364(a)(1); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2067. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Department of the Army's Letter of Offer to the People's Republic of China for defense articles, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2068. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting a report on the political contributions by Joseph Vener Reed, of Connecticut, to be Representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2069. A letter from the Under Secretary of State for Management, transmitting a report on the plans for implementation of travel controls on certain U.N. Secretariat employees, pursuant to Public Law 99-93,

section 141; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2070. A letter from the Chief Immigration Judge, Executive Office for Immigration Review, Department of Justice, transmitting a report on suspension of deportation of certain aliens of good character and with required residency when deportation causes hardship under section 244(a), Immigration and Nationality Act, pursuant to INA, section 244(c) (66 Stat. 214, 76 Stat. 1247); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2071. A letter from the Chairwoman, U.S. International Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's 43d quarterly report on trade between the United States and the nonmarket economy countries, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2440; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2072. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the Simplified Competitive Acquisition Technique Act of 1985; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Small Business.

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 281. Resolution providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 3, Joint resolution to prevent nuclear explosive testing; (Rept. 99-294). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. BURTON of California. Committee on Rules. House Resolution 282. Resolution waiving certain points of order against H.R. 3327, making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes (Rept. 99-295). Referred to the House Calendar.

### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RICHARDSON (for himself and Mr. LUJAN):

H.R. 3457. A bill to ensure the maintenance of a strong, reliable, and operational domestic uranium industry by requiring the Secretary of Energy to limit the use of non-domestic uranium by civilian nuclear power reactors; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. BOGGS:

H.R. 3458. A bill to provide for the equitable tax treatment of individuals subject to a divorce decree which retroactively terminates the community; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

H.R. 3459. A bill to amend the Steel Import Stabilization Act to support the President's national policy for the steel industry by stabilizing steel imports from countries not parties to bilateral arrangements under the President's national policy for the steel industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORNAN of California:

H.R. 3460. A bill to provide that no Federal court may require the expenditure of Federal or State moneys without prior legislative authorization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDGAR:

H.R. 3461. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide for a 2-year budgeting cycle, to provide for separate and timely consideration each of authorizing legislation, budget resolution, and appropriations, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations, and Rules.

By Mr. EDGAR:

H.R. 3462. A bill to require that the President transmit to the Congress, and that the congressional Budget Committees report, a balanced budget for each fiscal year; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations, and Rules.

By Mr. FASCELL (for himself, and Mr. BROOMFIELD) (by request):

H.R. 3463. A bill to authorize assistance to combat terrorism in Central America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FLIPPO (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. HUBBARD, and Mr. GORDON):

H.R. 3464. A bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 to establish an Office of Inspector General in the Tennessee Valley Authority; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FRANK (for himself, Mr. FISH, Mr. RUSSO, and Mr. GILMAN):

H.R. 3465. A bill to make permanent the requirements of the manufacturing clause of the copyright law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAYDOS:

H.R. 3466. A bill to extend the authorization of appropriations for general revenue sharing for 7 years; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GREGG:

H.R. 3467. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose a surcharge tax on business activities to provide revenues for the trust fund known as the "Hazardous Substance Response Superfund" with respect to the clean-up of hazardous wastes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H.R. 3468. A bill to extend through June 30, 1990, the suspension of import duties on synthetic rutile; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENKINS (for himself, Mr. FOWLER, and Mrs. COLLINS):

H.R. 3469. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to deny an employer a deduction for group health plan expenses unless such plan includes coverage for pediatric preventive health care; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Oklahoma (for himself, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. FOWLER, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. COYNE, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. DAUB, Mr. GREGG, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. STARK, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RINALDO,

Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. SCHEUER, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. BONKER, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. TAUKE, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, and Mr. DELAY).

H.R. 3470. A bill to establish the Social Security Administration as an independent agency, which shall be headed by a Social Security Board, and which shall be responsible for the administration of the old-age survivors, and disability insurance program under title II of the Social Security Act and the supplemental security income program under title XVI of such Act, and to provide for off-budget treatment of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program beginning with fiscal year 1987; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 3471. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to revise and extend the taxes used to finance the Superfund Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 3472. A bill to authorize humanitarian assistance for the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia:

H.R. 3473. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to consolidate the interstate construction and 4R programs, to establish a State and local block grant highway program, to increase flexibility in the use of toll revenues to finance highway projects, to extend the authorization of funds for Federal-aid highway programs through fiscal year 1990, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. TAUKE:

H.R. 3474. A bill to amend part A of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit imminently terminally ill patients to continue medicare coverage of their hospitalization; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 3475. A bill to expand and improve programs of adult and continuing education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DORNAN of California:

H.J. Res. 403. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit congressional review of court determinations that Federal or State law is invalid under the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL (for himself and Mr. BROOMFIELD) (by request):

H.J. Res. 404. Joint resolution with respect to the Agreement for Cooperation between the United States and the People's Republic of China concerning the peaceful uses of nuclear energy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.J. Res. 405. Joint resolution to designate October 17, 1985, as Black Poetry Day; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SLAUGHTER:

H.J. Res. 406. Joint resolution to commemorate the associations of the Clarke County region of Virginia with the national historic heritage during the sesquicentennial year of that county; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mr. MILLER of California):

H. Con. Res. 202. Concurrent resolution to request the President to provide economic

assistance to Mexico while enhancing the national security and energy preparedness of the United States by further filling the strategic petroleum reserve with petroleum obtained from Mexico; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Energy and Commerce, and Armed Services.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Con. Res. 203. Concurrent resolution authorizing printing of the brochure entitled "How Our Laws Are Made"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H. Res. 280. Resolution electing Representative Combest of Texas to the Committee on the District of Columbia; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H. Res. 283. Resolution returning to the Senate the bill S. 1712; considered and agreed to.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 44: Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 585: Mr. NELSON of Florida.

H.R. 598: Mr. SCHEUER.

H.R. 734: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. TORRICELLI, and Mrs. BENTLEY.

H.R. 760: Mr. SYNAR.

H.R. 776: Mr. NEAL and Mr. MORRISON of Washington.

H.R. 864: Mr. WHEAT.

H.R. 983: Mr. DAVIS, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. YATRON, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. MINETA, and Mr. MICA.

H.R. 1044: Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 1139: Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 1256: Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. VENTO, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 1432: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 1435: Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. DARDEN, and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H.R. 1458: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 1482: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1538: Mr. GRAY of Illinois.

H.R. 1550: Mr. MONSON.

H.R. 1759: Mr. BRYANT and Mrs. LLOYD.

H.R. 1769: Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 1770: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 1840: Mrs. BYRON, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. DAUB, Mr. PERKINS, and Mr. STALLINGS.

H.R. 1902: Mr. PARRIS.

H.R. 2080: Mr. HORTON, Mr. SILJANDER, and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 2185: Mr. RALPH M. HALL.

H.R. 2361: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H.R. 2504: Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 2532: Mr. DIOGUARDI.

H.R. 2656: Mr. KOLTER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. SEIBERLING, and Mr. JACOBS.

H.R. 2657: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 2659: Mrs. LLOYD, and Mr. GINGRICH.

H.R. 2663: Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia.

H.R. 2708: Mr. IRELAND.

H.R. 2741: Mr. KANJORSKI and Mr. HANSEN.

H.R. 2762: Mr. GRAY of Illinois.

H.R. 2807: Mr. MILLER of Ohio.

H.R. 2840: Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. HAMMER-SCHMIDT, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. ECKART of Ohio, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. OWENS, Mr. GUARINI, and Mr. DASCHLE.

H.R. 2866: Mr. CROCKETT and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 2870: Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. DIXON, Mr. CARPER, Mr. KOST-MAYER, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. LUKE, and Mr. WEISS.

H.R. 2873: Mr. LUKE, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. COYNE, Mr. McCLOSKEY, and Mrs. HOLT.

H.R. 2950: Mr. JACOBS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BEILENSEN, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. HEFTTEL of Hawaii, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 3045: Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 3050: Mr. RINALDO and Mr. KASICH.

H.R. 3082: Mr. ROBINSON and Mrs. BOXER.

H.R. 3083: Mr. ROBINSON and Mrs. BOXER.

H.R. 3084: Mr. PURSELL.

H.R. 3099: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 3130: Mr. SWIFT.

H.R. 3132: Mr. WOLPE, Mr. McKINNEY, Mr. APPELGADE, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. BEILENSEN,

Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BATES, Mr. CLAY, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. KASTENMEIER,

Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. STARK, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. SEIBERLING, and Mrs. HOLT.

H.R. 3173: Mr. HATCHER.

H.R. 3206: Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 3207: Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 3258: Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. PEPPER,

Mr. MATSUI, Mr. LELAND, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. COELHO, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 3263: Mr. VALENTINE and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 3297: Mr. BRYANT.

H.R. 3344: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WORTLEY,

Mr. MURPHY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. ROE, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. OAKAR, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.J. Res. 7: Mr. WOLF, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ROTH, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. KINDNESS.

H.J. Res. 105: Mrs. LONG.

H.J. Res. 126: Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. FUSTER.

H.J. Res. 127: Mr. MOAKLEY.

H.J. Res. 133: Mr. ROSE, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. COURTER, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, and Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.J. Res. 172: Mr. AU COIN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CARR, Mr. CRANE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. FISH, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. KEMP, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LENT, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. McKINNEY, Mr. MANTON, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. REGULA, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SABO, Mr. SAVAGE, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. STARK, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. TORRES, Mr. WHITTAKER, and Mr. KLECZKA.

H.J. Res. 175: Mr. STRANG.

H.J. Res. 267: Mr. SKEEN and Mr. MOLINARI.

H.J. Res. 279: Mr. FRANKLIN.

H.J. Res. 313: Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr.



GAYDOS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. NATCHER, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. FISH.

H.J. Res. 329: Mr. AU COIN, Mr. BARNES, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BATES, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CARR, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DYSON, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. RALPH M. HALL, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HENRY, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. LATTI, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LENT, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. LUKE, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. MOORE, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. NEAL, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. REGULA, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SABO, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. WILSON, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GALLO, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. CRANE, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. GROTEBERG, and Mr. KLECZKA.

H.J. Res. 331: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. APPELGATE, Mr. BARNES, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BEDELL, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BORSKI, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. COELHO, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. CONTE, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DYSON, Mr. ECKERT of New York, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FISH, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HENRY, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KASICH, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LENT, Mr. LEVIN of Florida, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. O'BRIEN, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. QUILLIN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. REGULA, Mr. REID, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROE, Mr. SABO, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, and Mr. CHANDLER.

H.J. Res. 334: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BREAUX, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. MCKERNAN, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. RAY, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROSE, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WHITLEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BEILSON,

Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. HALL of Ohio.

H.J. Res. 350: Mr. DERRICK, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. THOMAS of Georgia.

H.J. Res. 375: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DAUB, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. KASICH, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. SAVAGE, and Mr. WORTLEY.

H.J. Res. 379: Mr. DAUB, Mr. HORTON, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. DWYER, of New Jersey, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii, Mr. DYSON, Mr. REID, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. MONSON, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. CONTE, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. ROE, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. RAY, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. WEISS, Mr. SMITH of Florida, and Mrs. KENNELLY.

H.J. Res. 385: Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. RALPH M. HALL, Mr. WILSON, Mr. APPELGATE, Mr. MINETA, Mr. DAUB, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. CONTE, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. ROSE.

H.J. Res. 386: Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. RODINO, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. MACK, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. PETRI, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. WISE, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. HILER, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. BATES, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. REID, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. ZSCHAU, Mr. CHANDLER, Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. STUMP, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. McCANDLESS, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. SNYDER, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. MCCAIN, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. FAZIO.

H. Con. Res. 15: Mrs. BOXER.

H. Con. Res. 180: Mr. BARNES, Mr. FRANK, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GORDON, Mr. TALLON, Mr. PORTER, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, and Mr. FASCCELL.

H. Res. 76: Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. McDADE, Mr. LENT, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. LELAND, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. PORTER, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DELAY, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. SMITH of Florida, and Mr. MINETA.

H. Res. 180: Mr. WALKER, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. COBLE, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. ROE, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. McCANDLESS, Mr. MCKERNAN, and Mr. HYDE.

H. Res. 194: Mr. YATES, Mr. LELAND, Mr. HOWARD, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. JONES of Oklahoma, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H. Res. 256: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mrs.

COLLINS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. SMITH of Florida, and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H. Res. 268: Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. BATES, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DICKS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. GALLO, Mr. COYNE, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. MICA, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. SHARP, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. RALPH M. HALL, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. HYDE, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. RITTER, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. CHAPPIE, and Mr. SKELTON.

H. Res. 271: Mr. MANTON, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. LENT, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. ROE, Mr. ADDABO, and Mr. WALGREN.

### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

220. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Board of Supervisors, County of Yuba, California, relative to the establishment of crisis control centers; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

221. Also, petition of Flor de Luz E. Angerson, Philippines, relative to citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

222. Also, petition of Carlos S. Angerson, relative to citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

223. Also, petition of the American Association of Retired Persons, Chapter 2849, Rutherford, NC, relative to deficits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

### AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

#### H.R. 3424

By Mr. OWENS:

—Page 64, immediately after line 2, insert the following new section:

Sec. 515. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be obligated or expended to issue, implement, or administer any contract entered into after the date of enactment of this Act for the performance by a non-governmental commercial source of library services for a Federal department, agency, or other entity.

By Mr. WISE:

—Page 8, line 18, strike out "\$984,022,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$987,545,000".

Page 8, line 25, strike out "\$15,297,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$18,820,000".

#### H.J. Res. 3

By Mr. HYDE:

(Amendment in the nature of a substitute.)

—Strike out the preamble and in lieu thereof insert the following:

Whereas the United States is committed to the prevention of nuclear war through substantial, verifiable, equitable, and militarily significant reductions in nuclear arms;

Whereas in Geneva the United States and the Soviet Union are engaged in negotiations to reduce nuclear arms;

Whereas a viable nuclear deterrent is at present necessary for the security of the United States and its allies;

Whereas the United States, in recognizing a dispute within the scientific community concerning the inadequacy of verification of test bans, is in the process of improving its present verification capabilities in the interest of peace and stability;

Whereas the United States Government has concluded, based upon a thorough evaluation of the evidence, that the Soviet Union may have violated the Threshold Test Ban Treaty;

Whereas the interest of the United States in verification improvements has been dem-

onstrated by repeated proposals to the Soviet Union to enhance verification of the Threshold Test Ban Treaty;

Whereas the President appealed to the Soviet Union at the United Nations on September 24, 1984, to "cooperate in this undertaking and to reciprocate in a manner that will enable the two countries to establish the basis for verification for effective limits on underground nuclear testing"; and

Whereas the President on July 29, 1985, demonstrated his commitment to the process that could ultimately lead to effective verification of the Threshold Test Ban Treaty by inviting the Soviet Union to send experts, with any instrumentation devices they deem necessary, to measure the yield of a nuclear test at the U.S. test site: Now, therefore, be it

Struck out all after the resolving clause and in lieu thereof insert the following:

That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States should—

(1) continue efforts to gain agreement by the Government of the Soviet Union to measures which will improve verification of the Threshold Test Ban Treaty and the Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty, and ultimately a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty;

(2) reaffirm mutual compliance of the Threshold Test Ban Treaty; and

(3) continue to work toward the attainment of a verifiable Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty following the achievement of mutual, substantial, verifiable, and militarily significant nuclear arms reductions.